THE PROBLEM OF ETIOLOGICAL NARRATIVE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

by

'Connor

Burke O. Long

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty
of the Graduate School of Yale University
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

1967

SUMMARY

In etymological materials, two distinct forms expressive of etiological interests were found to be operative. Form I was structured so as to report a naming, a name, and its reason (making a word play on the given name). There were no constitutive links to surrounding narrative material. Form II was characterized by a reported event from which an inference to a name was drawn by means of a stereotypical על-כן clause. In this case, there was a functional connection to narrative tradition. However, as marks for developed etiological narrative, the etymological forms offer little. They appeared as formulae (Form I), or short reports (Form II and Mixed Forms) in secondary or at least subordinate layers of tradition.

An ôth Schema (והיה לאות) and a Question-Answer Form were defined as forms expressive of significative etiology. They explained the origin and significance in Israel's common life of certain phenomena and customs. As speech, epilogue, or secondary expansion on older tradition, both forms stood disconnected from narrative material, and thus did not serve as marks for etiological narrative.

These essentially negative results, coupled with those of B. S. Childs, show how subjective the so-called marks of etiological narrative have been. Further, they call into question the common method of identifying or reconstructing stories of alleged etiological purpose, especially in cases of highly developed narrative. In general, the results show the necessity for deriving criteria fundamentally different from those used since Gunkel's pioneering work in Genesis.

CONTENTS

PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

SECTION I ETYMOLOGY AS ETIOLOGY 1

- Part A Etymology of Form II Type 9
- Part B Etymology of Form I Type 44
- Part C Etymology of Mixed Type 64
- Part D Summary and Conclusions 100
- Appendix 101

SECTION II SIGNIFICATIVE ETIOLOGY 117

- Part A *Ôth* Schema as Etiology 117
- Part B Question-Answer Schema as Etiology 144
- Part C Significative Etiological Narrative 157

SECTION III CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS 161

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY 177

ABBREVIATIONS

ANET^2	Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (2nd edition)
BASOR	Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
EvTh	Evangelische Theologie
GK^2	Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. E. Kautzsch (2nd English edition)
JAOS	Journal of the American Oriental Society
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JNES	Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JSS	Journal of Semitic Studies
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
Or	Orientalia
RB	Revue Biblique
SThZ	Schweizerische Theologische Zeitschrift
Suppl. VT	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VT	Vetus Testamentum
ZAW	Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZThK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

INTRODUCTION

A classic definition of etiological narrative in Greek mythology as formulated by M. P. Nilsson runs:

> . . . a narrative which seeks to explain why something has come to be, or why it has become such and such.[1]

This general formulation is standard and widespread, whether the literary effects are viewed with a primary interest in anthropology, comparative religion and mythology, or comparative literature.[2] The definition was early applied to Israelitic literature by Old Testament scholars,[3] and has continued to be commonly accepted. Such a formulation, however, encourages the kind of negative evaluation of the historical work of etiological tradition which Albrecht Alt, for example, gave.[4] On the other hand, it speaks of a story's function without describing those characteristics which actually reveal its overall etiological purpose. One simply reconstructs a question--the hypothetical Kinderfrage--which a given myth, legend, or saga seeks to answer.

---

[1] *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*^{2} (Munich: Beck, 1941), vol. I, p. 25.

[2] Cf. for example, Andrew Lang, *Myth, Ritual and Religion* (London: Longmans, Green and Company, 1887), vol. I, pp. 163 ff. and *passim*; E. B. Tyler, *Primitive Culture*^{2} (New York: Henry Holt, 1873), pp. 368 ff. Recently, A. E. Jensen, *Mythos und Kult Bei Naturvölkern* (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1951), pp. 91 ff. In comparative literature, cf. A. H. Krappe, *The Science of Folk-Lore* (New York: Dial Press, 1930), pp. 60 ff. and *passim*; Stith Thompson, *The Folktale* (New York: Dryden, 1946); Lutz Röhrich, *Märchen und Wirklichkeit*^{2} (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), pp. 27 ff.

[3] Hermann Gunkel, *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1901), pp. XX-XXVI and *passim*. The introduction to this commentary is translated as *The Legends of Genesis: The Biblical Saga and History* (New York: Schocken Books, 1964). Cf. also Hugo Gressmann, *Die Anfänge Israels*^{2} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1914), p. 15 f. and *passim*.

This fundamental unclarity remains in the current discussion of Old Testament etiological narrative. There are two distinct, but related questions: (a) What are the marks of etiological narrative? (b) How is a given etiological narrative related to real history?

The two fold nature of the issue is often obscured. This became especially clear in the notorious disagreement between John Bright and what he termed the "Alt-Noth School."[5] Bright focused on the second question by criticizing the emphasis which the Alt-Noth school placed on "etiology as a creative factor in the formation of tradition," and by suggesting that

> where historical traditions are concerned, not only can it be proved that the etiological factor

---

[4] A. Alt, "Josua," now reprinted in his Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israels, vol. I (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1953), pp. 176-192. Cf. especially pp. 184 f.

[5] Early Israel in Recent History Writing: A Study in Method (Chicago: Aldenson, 1956). Earlier, W. F. Albright, "The Israelite Conquest of Canaan in the Light of Archaeology," BASOR, 74 (1939), pp. 11-23. Bright is referring to Alt's work on Josua, op. cit., and Noth's Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948), passim. Cf. also M. Noth, Das Buch Josua^2 (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), passim.

> is often secondary in the formation of these traditions, it cannot be proved that it was ever primary.[6]

The question of the form critical marks of genuine etiological narrative, or even "etiological factors," and its bearing on the historian's problem is left imprecisely formulated and almost untouched in Bright's critique.

Noth[7] has attempted to speak to the disagreement by conceding that genuine historical recollections might take an etiological form. But they might not. One has to reckon, therefore, with a whole range of probabilities. This necessitates a careful analysis of individual cases to see whether the link between the events narrated and the phenomenon explained is genuinely historical or secondary.

At this point the other aspect of the issue emerges. According to Noth, an "etiological interpretation" of a given narrative tradition is justified only where certain well defined "marks" within the narrative demand it.[8] But he mentions only one such characteristic, namely the formula "until this day." This, of course, cannot be used mechanically to identify etiological narrative. However, to the extent that one remains unclear as to precisely how this sign relates to narrative materials, and how it reveals the function of its "story" context, and to the extent that other marks of etiological narrative remain unexamined, the two fold issue is obscured, if not rendered insoluble. One should mention here the review of the problem offered by J. L. Seeligman, who attempts to clarify the concept of etiology, and define its applicability to various Biblical materials.[9]

---

[6] Bright, op. cit., p. 91.

[7] "Der Beitrag der Archäologie zur Geschichte Israels," Supplement to Vetus Testamentum 7 (1960), pp. 278 ff.

[8] Idem.

Recently, Claus Westermann has sought to clarify the matter in a fresh way by focusing on the problem of the marks of etiological narrative.[10] If one proceeds from his fundamental criterion for a genuine narrative, i.e., one which describes a dramatic movement from a tension to its resolution,[11] then an etiological narrative of this type can only be one in which the path from question--which the etiology raises--to answer--which the etiological conclusion gives--coincides with the way leading from tension to resolution.[12] Thus, where one meets an etiological motif, the important question is what function it has in the wider textual unit and what this unit represents exclusive of the etiological motif.[13]

---

[9] J. L. Seeligman, "Aetiological Elements in Biblical Historiography," _Zion_: _Quarterly for Research in Jewish History_ 26 (1961), pp. 141-169. (English summary.)

[10] _Forschung Am Alten Testament_ (_Gesammelte Studien_) [Munich: Kaiser, 1964], pp. 39-47.

[11] Derived from his analysis of "promise narratives," _ibid_., pp. 18 ff.

[12] _Ibid_., p. 40.

My own work runs independently of Westermann's. Yet it fills out his program by attempting to define more precisely in controlled circumstances certain "etiological motifs" and how they in fact relate to the narrative material in which they appear. In a wider sense, I am speaking to the first aspect of the current discussion by searching for, and examining, repetitive "marks" of limited varieties of etiological narrative.

The investigation--limited to the material in Genesis through II Kings--seeks to define the formal structure and function of the following phrases commonly held to be etiological:

(1) Etymological clauses
    (a) "And he called (ויקרא) the (his) name so and so for he (she) said such and such."
    (b) Therefore one calls (על-כן קרא) the name (of that place) so and so.
(2) "It shall be a sign. . . ." (והיה לאות)
(3) "What does such and such mean (to you)?" (מה ... לך)

On the primary level of the history of tradition, wherever the formula appears integrally related to narrative material, the relational lines constitutive of the connection are described in a functional way. The study leads, therefore, to certain conclusions regarding the marks of narrative material which functions etiologically. The concluding chapter draws a few further implications for the commonly accepted way of identifying and reconstructing etiological narrative.[14]

---

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

---

[14] This study was completed when two new monographs by A. Ibañez Arana were brought to my attention: La Narración Etiológica Como Género Literario and Las Etiologias Etimológicas del Pentateuco. These works were inaccessible to me.

SECTION I

ETYMOLOGICAL ETIOLOGIES

Johannes Fichtner[1] isolated two basic formulae which report the giving of a name and a reason for it. His Form I appeared in the following schema:

> And he (she) named the (his, her, or its)
> name (of the or that) place so and so
>
> For he (she, they) said: (now follows the
> etymological explanation for the name)

This full formula is found in Ex. 2:22.

ויקרא את-שמו גרשם β

כי אמר גר הייתי בארץ נכריה γ

The schema occurs in this full form only rarely. Many minor variations appear. Most of the time אמר is missing and therefore *kî* introduces either a direct quotation (Gen. 4:25) or an objective causal clause (Gen. 3:20; 26:20).[2] Occasionally כי אמר or כי is replaced with לאמר (Gen. 5:29) or with ויאמר כי (Gen. 26:22).[3] The constant elements in the form are the following:

---

[1] J. Fichtner, "Die Etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebung der Geschichtlicher Bücher des Alten Testaments," *VT* 6 (1956), pp. 372-396.

[2] Num. 13:24 has the causal clause introduced with על-אודות.

[3] Fichtner, *op. cit.*, p. 379.

(a) The *act* of naming is *narrated* in the historical tense by the use of waw conversive prefix form of the verb *qr'* with a specific subject.

(b) The etymological explanation (γ element), with affix verb form follows the name giving itself. Occasionally a quotation or short statement which provides the motivation for the name, precedes the β element, which stands alone in such cases. The narrative force of β however, is not appreciably lessened, but is retained in the feminine verb (ותקרא). This pattern is common on the occasion of birth (e.g., Gen. 29:33; 30:7 f. 10 f. 12 f.).

(c) The γ element always contains a key word which is assonant with the name given. When the γ element is missing, a word play (not always assonance) is clear in an immediately preceding speech (e.g., Gen. 29:33). Thus the causal relationship between the name and an event or utterance is implicit in the waw conversive form of the verb and the accompanying word play, or explicit in the full γ element.

Form II isolated by Fichtner occurs mostly according to the following schema:[4]

---

[4] *Idem*.

Therefore (על-כן) one calls the (its)
name (of that place) so and so.

The fundamental form is apparent in Ex. 15:23:

על-כן קרא שמה מרה

In two cases this formula has been expanded by the addition of a kî causal clause which expresses the motivation for the particular name (Gen. 11:9; 21:31). This expansion may have come about through the influence of the γ elements of Form I (ויקרא .... כי). It certainly appears to be a secondary development in the oral stages of tradition history.[5]

Other variations occur as well. In one instance קרא is missing (Gen. 26:33). Two passages use Niph קרא (Gen. 2:23; 17:5), and two show Niph אמר (Gen. 22:14; 32:29). Sometimes the verb קרא is modified by the adverbial עד-היום (הזה) (e.g., II Chron. 20:26; Josh. 7:26b; Jdg. 18:12). Sometimes the name itself or the place is modified by the phrase (e.g., Gen. 26:33; Jdg. 15:19).

The constant features of the form are as follows:

(a) Form II is always introduced by על-כן .

(b) The act of naming is not narrated. Rather, the formula expresses a logical inference from speech, reported event, or descriptive report. The link between these elements and the name is always explicit in a word play. There is a clear contrast with surrounding material, which normally relates by means of waw conversive yiqtal verb forms a sequence of successive events. At the end point, Form II breaks the recitation with a logical inference whose function, though sharing something of a narrative character at times, cannot be fully understood as simple historical narration (e.g., Jos. 7:26 or II Chron. 20:26). The narrative movement, as it were, ceases and a conclusion is drawn. This is the usual function of על-כן with a qatal verb form in the midst of narrative prose, whether the verb has a definite or indefinite subject (definite: Gen. 47:22; Jos. 14:14; indefinite: I Sam. 10:12. Cf. the use of על-כן in I Sam. 27:6. More distant, Ex. 20:11// Dt. 5:15).[6] Of course, the inferential function is most sharply distinguished from historical recitation where the subject of the verb is indefinite. Such is the case in most of the occurrences of Form II (cf. below).

---

[5] This is a modification of Fichtner's assertion that Form II occurs mostly in this expanded stage. The opposite is the case. Excluding the occurrences of mixed forms, fifteen of the eighteen cases in the historical books do not show a kî clause. (Cf. Fichtner, op. cit., p. 380.)

---

[6] Occurrences of על-כן and qatal verb form in speeches were excluded because they did not reflect historical narration as such. On the logical function of על-כן alone, cf. E. König, Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräische Sprache (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1895), vol. II/1, p. 327, and vol. II/2, p. 538. Also, H. Ewald, Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Clark, 1879. ET of German 8th edition), prgr. 353b.

(c) The subject of the verb is always indefinite in those cases where the verb is modified by עד־היום הזה [7] and therefore best translated by English passive, e.g., "That is why its name is called so and so . . ." (Cf. Jos. 7:26; Jgs. 18:12). The same is true in those cases in which the singular or plural pronomial subject of *qr'* cannot refer meaningfully to the agent in the immediately preceding context.[8] There remain only four cases where the subject of the verb may be definite.[9] Of these, one text (II Sam. 5:20) is given a passive formulation in all Greek manuscripts, and made indefinite in the parallel passage (I Chron. 14:11). All four passages are structured in a way typical of other

---

[7] B. S. Childs, "A Study of the Formula 'Until this Day,'" *JBL* 82 (1963), p. 281. Also, Fichtner, *op. cit.*, p. 381. The passages are Gen. 26:33b; Jos. 7:26; Jgs. 18:12; II Chron. 20:26.

[8] Gen. 11:9; 21:31; 50:11; Ex. 15:23; I Chron. 14:11.

[9] Gen. 19:21; 33:17; II Sam. 5:20; Jgs. 15:19. Excluded are those passages where the context of Form II is unclear: Gen. 25:30b; I Chron. 11:7b; I Sam. 23:28; Gen. 16:13f. Cf. below, p. 10ff.

Form II occurrences. While certainty is not possible because of the ambiguity in the Hebrew grammar, it seems likely that these four cases also must be read with an indefinite subject. In this case, the inference to a name becomes a proposition of general applicability for all times.

It happens that Form II is used almost exclusively for place name etymologies.[10] Form I, while showing a more mixed application, has an affinity for personal names.[11] Clearly, each formula is etiological. Each purports to explain the origin of a known name in terms of event, utterance, or phenomenon which is brought into a causal relationship to the giving of the name. In my opinion, the adverbial phrase עד־היום הזה seldom has anything to do with this causality. Only in those few cases in which the phrase modifies the inference (על־כן קרא or ויקרא in mixed forms) is it related in any direct way to the nexus of the etiology, namely the causal relation between event and name (cf. II Chron. 20:26; Josh. 7:26b; Jgs. 18:12; also the mixed form in Josh. 5:9). These occurrences may show an original function for עד־היום הזה in the etiological formula.[12]

---

[10] Fichtner, op. cit., p. 380.

[11] Ibid., p. 381.

[12] Childs, op. cit., pp. 281 f.

Rather more commonly, however, the phrase modifies something more distant to the etiology proper:

(a) The place which is named

Mixed Form: Jgs. 6:24

Form II: Jgs. 15:19

(b) The name itself

Mixed Form: Jgs. 1:26

Form II: Gen. 26:33b[13]

(c) Effect of a story's resolution

Form I: Gen. 19:37.38

The fundamental agreement in all cases of "until this day" occurring in the context of Form II or Mixed Form is that the phrase establishes the extension into the future of something related to the events narrated. But relatively seldom is the nexus of the etiology given a continuity into the narrator's time.[14]

The task now is to seek the various ways in which these formulae relate to a narrative context. The focus must be at the earliest visible stage of tradition history because the attempt is to discover the characteristics of narrative material which in itself, irrespective of its final position in a literary complex, functions integrally with the etymological etiological formula to explain the origin and meaning of a name. Obviously, therefore, those occurrences of the formulae which are literary glosses on received tradition as well as those cases in which the earlier connections in the growth of traditions are quite obscure, are immediately eliminated from the discussion. The occurrences remaining are then grouped, through literary and tradition history criticism, according to the degree of complexity of narrative material surrounding the formula. The examination then proceeds from simplest to most complex examples and reveals in the progression various, but repetitive, relational lines existing between formula and its accompanying "story" matter.

---

[13] The formula here is defective, since the usual verb of the β element, qr', is missing in MT, though attested in LXX. It stands closest, however, to Form II.

[14] Childs, op. cit., p. 282. On the Mixed Forms, cf. below, pp. 64ff.

PART A. ETYMOLOGY OF FORM II TYPE

1. Occurrences eliminated from discussion

a. A literary gloss

Gen. 25:30b appears to be a gloss for the following reasons:

(1) The clumsiness of the expression מן-האדם האדם הזה and the sudden shift in vocabulary from נזיד (vs. 29.34) to האדם (vs. 30).

(2) The ~~weak~~ connection of Esau with Edom elsewhere is very weak (Gen. 32:4; 36.1.8.19 /P/).

(3) The name tradition, especially vs. 30b, clearly is a digressive motif, since the whole piece (vs. 29-34) focuses on the selling of the birthright.[15]

b. Etymological word play missing or obscure

I Chron. 11:7b and I Sam. 23:28 are grouped here. The former simply reports the designation of a city as "city of David" without the word play characteristic of intentional etymologies (cf. Gen. 4:17). This particular half verse may only reflect the Chronicler's penchant for precise identification (cf. I Chr. 11:4.5; 5:1 ff.).

---

[15] Cf. H. Gunkel, Genesis (third edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1910), p. 297; E. A. Speiser, Genesis (New York: Doubleday, 1964), p. 197.

In the case of I Sam. 23:28, the play, if intended, on the name is obscure in the context. The noun מחלקות elsewhere appears in a concrete sense as "division" (cf. Jos. 11:23; 12:7). This meaning can only be applied with difficulty to I Sam. 23:28.[16] Others have understood the name as "Rock of Escape(s)." This meaning perhaps fits the context, but is otherwise unattested for חלק.[17]

c. Problematical analysis

The classic text difficulties in Gen. 16:13 f. seriously impair any glimpse of the original connections between vs. 14, where Form II occurs, and vs. 13 and preceding, where something like Form I appears. The crux of the problem rests in the hopelessly corrupt vs. 13b, which since Wellhausen[18] has been emended to read, "Have I really seen God and yet live after seeing him?" This suggestion accords with the sense of the name given in vs. 14, and has met with general acceptance. But it, of course, assumes connections which need to be explicit in any study of etiological narrative.

---

[16] Cf. Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text . . . of the Books of Samuel* (second edition; Oxford: Clarendon, 1913), pp. 190 f.

[17] C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), prgr. 19.969 observes that in personnel lists, *hlq* appears to be the opposite of "present or accounted for." The texts: 2016: II, 2.4.8.14.18.

[18] Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 189 f., for a summary up to 1910.

In the case of Gen. 31:48, a literary analysis of the wider context cannot with any certainty or agreement be carried out. The text suddenly becomes very clumsy in vs. 43, and the material which follows seems to reflect a complex intermingling of two accounts of a treaty--perhaps each attached to a different locale. Division of the section into sources is futile, not in the least because the LXX represents still another stage in the complex history of this tradition.[19] Thus a clearly defined narrative context for the etymological formula II in vs. 48 cannot be isolated.

2. Simplest report

a. Overview

Three occurrences are grouped in this category: II Chron. 20:26; Gen. 33:17 (J); Ex. 15:23 (J?). All passages reveal Form II at its clearest, and refer to place names. Characteristically, the formula על-כן קרא .... is the final element in a three part structure:

(1) The locale is mentioned (its name is anticipated)

---

[19] Contrast the attempts of J. Wellhausen, Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testament (third edition; Berlin: Walter deGruyter, 1899), pp. 41 f. and Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 350 ff., and Speiser, Genesis, p. 248, and S. R. Driver, The Book of Genesis (second edition; London; Methuen, 1904), p. 287. The Greek of vss. 46 ff. has quite a different sequence of elements.

(2) Report of an event at this location

(3) Inference to the name of the place (Form II)

Each passage expresses a subordinate motif in a larger context.

b. The material

1. II Chron. 20:26

There are no sound reasons for considering this verse to be a literary insertion into an older text. Yet there can hardly be any doubt that the etymological motif is subordinate to the narrative movement of the wider context. The main lines move through (1) impending battle (vss. 1 f.); (2) calling upon Yahweh (vss. 3-21); (3) the battle [Yahweh defeats the enemy, spoil is taken, and the troops return home (vss. 22-29)]. A parallel sequence appears in II Chron. 14:8-14. The broad outline is present also in I Chron. 20:1-3, II Chron. 25:20-24, and Jos. 10:5-15. (More distant, cf. II Chron. 34:1-7.) In view of this conventional reporting style, the detail of a name etymology obviously expresses a minor motif. The judgment is further confirmed by the somewhat odd usage of the kî subordinating conjunction in vs. 26b. Its syntactical relation to the immediately preceding clause (vs. 26a) is rather loose, but nevertheless typical of II Chronicles. The word introduces material which one would describe in English as parenthetical in relation to its wider context. (Cf. II Chron. 7:7; 11:21; 12:13; 28:21, possibly 29:36. Contrast the much more integrative function of causal *kî* in II Chron. 20:27.) Thus from the syntactical point of view as well, the name tradition is a subordinate motif. Finally, vs. 26 must be viewed as a complete unit here because of the definite shifts in locale which delineate the changing scenes in the whole narrative. The action moves from a vague "wilderness of Tekoa" (vs. 20.24) to "Beracah" (vs. 26) to "Jerusalem" (vss. 27 ff.).

Now vs. 26 makes up a simplest Form II report which falls into three distinct parts:

(a) Report of arrival at a particular locale
(the name is anticipated)
(b) Report of an event (*kî* clause)
(c) Name tradition (Form II)

The typical features of Form II stand out clearly. The first two elements of the report are most naturally understood as historical narration employing *qatal* verb forms as English preterite. They report actions successive in time. But with the final element, the narrative movement ceases, and a conclusion is drawn. Here a definite logical transition from event (act of "blessing") to a name (Valley of Blessing) is made. The relation between the two elements is defined by the assonantal word play. Moreover, the subject of the verb קראו must be indefinite, as the act of calling is given a continuity in time by the addition of עד־היום .[20]

---

[20] The Chronicler is accustomed to using third masculine plural for an indefinite construction. Cf. II Chron. 16:14; 25:28; 27:9; I Chron. 24:4. So A. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1909), p. 7.

2. Gen. 33:17 (J)

This verse presents a picture similar to the above. Although the verse is not totally independent of the preceding account (vss. 1-11.12-16) concerning Jacob and Esau, it surely is subordinate to the main dramatic development. Indeed, vs. 17 is perhaps best seen as one of a series of loosely linked reports (vss. 18.19 f.) which follow the connected narrative.[21]

As a complete unit, the verse comprises a simplest Form II report in which the locale to be named is specified, event(s) reported, and a name deduced. The inferential movement typically is shown by על-כן and the logical link made with the use of סכת in both report and name. The sharpness of the distinction between inferential and narrative function is somewhat diminished by the ambiguity in the subject of יקרא . Does one translate "Therefore he (Jacob) called the name of the place Succoth," or "Therefore (that is why) one calls the place Succoth"? In view of the discussion above (p. 5f.), the latter choice seems more likely. In any case, the inferential function is clear, and contrasts with the simple historical recitation in the preceding material (ויבן and נסע and עשה).

---

[21] For example, cf. G. von Rad, *Genesis* (ET of German edition of 1956; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), p. 323; Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 368. Martin Noth speaks of a "short etiological note." (*Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* [Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948], p. 111.)

3. Ex. 15:23

This verse likely preserves another example of the simplest Form II report. The verse appears in the midst of an old tradition (vss. 22b-25a) now framed by P itinerary notes (vs. 22a.27) and expanded by a piece probably stemming from the Dtr school (vss. 25b-26).[22] Noth[23] has argued that the "murmuring" motif (vs. 24) is relatively young since the facts given presuppose at the most only that the people be threatened by a lack of food or water. The earliest form of the tradition, then, may have involved only vss. 22b-23.25a. But this is not sure. In any case, the etymological motif is now subordinate to the thematic lines which reach their climax in the granting of palatable water (vs. 25a).[24]

Only to this extent is one justified in observing that vs. 23, when viewed alone, comprises a typical Form II simplest report. There is a locale mentioned, anticipating the name, the report of a situation and its cause, and an inference to a name--cast in clear impersonal terms since the singular subject of qr' has no referent, and contrasting with the historical narrative tenses all around (ויבאו ; לא יכלו לשתת ; vs. 24 וילנו ; vs. 25 ויצעק). This simplest report, however, is now integrally woven into the fabric of the larger "wonder" legend in such a way that the grounds for the name's derivation are also the presupposition for the story's resolution. There is no question, then, of the whole functioning to explain the name in vs. 23.

---

[22] M. Noth, *Exodus* (ET of German edition of 1959; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), p. 127; G. Beer, *Exodus* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1939), p. 85, differs only slightly.

[23] Noth, *Pentateuch*, p. 135.

[24] H. Gressmann (*Die Anfänge Israels* [Göttingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1914], p. 77) and B. Baentsch (*Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numeri* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1903], p. 142) and others, reading ממרה in vs. 23 as "because of bitterness," take כי מרים הם as an explanatory gloss. Later critics generally do not follow this suggestion.

3. Simple report

a. Overview

Four occurrences of Form II are described here as simple report: Gen. 50:11; I Chron. 14:11 // II Sam. 5:20, and Jgs. 18:12. They all have to do with place names and express a subordinate motif in a wider context. In all four passages, the basic features of the simplest Form II report are present and surpassed. New material generally described as a narrative setting has been introduced and related organically, but in various ways, to the etiological inference. Each report expresses a subordinate motif in a larger whole. Only one, Gen. 50:10b-11, gives evidence of being a secondary literary expansion.

1. Gen. 50:11

In general, vss. 1-14 of chapter 50 have been identified essentially as J material with fragments of E (chiefly in vss. 9-10a) and P (vss. 12-13).[25] Noth has proposed alternatively to view vss. 1-10a.14a as J and vss. 10b-11 as an expansion by a JE redactor, but using E material.[26] In favor of this general division is the fact that vs. 9, usually cited as E, is not really parallel to vss. 7.8 of J. Furthermore, vs. 9 continues the image of large numbers so prominant in vss. 7b-8. But with vs. 10b begins a real doublet: the mourning over Jacob's body is reported a second time. The verse suddenly introduces a word for "mourning" (אבל) which contrasts with vs. 10a (ויספדו, מספד), and which is clearly linked to the paronomasia on the place name in vs. 11. Moreover, in vs. 10b a singular verb appears rather abruptly. In view of all this, it seems reasonable to consider vss. 10b-11 as a secondary expansion on older tradition.

Now the unit vss. 10b-11 falls into three main divisions:

(1) Setting (report of mourning אבל vs. 10b)

(2) Action

  (a) Witnessing the mourning (אבל)

    (locale specified)

---

[25] Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 487 ff. and Speiser, *Genesis*, pp. 373 ff. Most recently and thoroughly, L. Ruppert, *Die Josepherzählung der Genesis* (Munich: Kosel, 1965), pp. 190 ff.

[26] Noth, *Pentateuch*, pp. 37 f. and 31. Verses 12 f. stem from P.

(b) Speech of the witnesses (אבל)

(3) Inference to a name

(geographical note)

The features characteristic of the Form II simplest report are present here: locale (although the name is not anticipated), reported event(s), inference to the name (formulated with על-כן and an impersonal subject, since the singular has no clear referent).[27]

What is new here is the expanded report structure which functions integrally to provide the basis for the inference. A setting given in vs. 10b reports the general situation, but already anticipates what is to follow by sounding the catch word (אבל) and by providing the condition upon which the successive events arise. These in turn, specifically the Canaanites' speech, furnish the direct foundation for the inference to the name. In light of the narrative structure, the cessation of narrative movement in the conclusive clause (על-כן קרא ....) is even more striking. The expression contrasts with the preceding succession of waw conversive yiqtal forms (ויעש ; ויאמר וירא) and their resumption in vs. 12. Yet the whole piece is held together by the repetition of the key word אבל . There is no doubt that vss. 10b-11 function as a unit to explain a name.[28]

---

[27] Even though grammatically possible, the subject is hardly "Joseph."

2. I Chron. 14:11 (= II Sam. 5:20)

There is no reason to consider vs. 11 a secondary insertion into the Chronicles text.[29] But the etymological tradition clearly plays a subordinate role in the wider thematic development. The reported events move through a conventional sequence:

(1) Threat to the people - vs. 9

(2) Consultation with Yahweh (שאל בְ)
Divine answer

(3) Action on the basis of answer - vs. 11
(removal of the threat, i.e. defeat of the enemy)

One sees, of course, this structure in the parallel passage II Sam. 5:17-21. It is also obvious in I Chron. 14:13-16 (= II Sam. 5:22-25), I Sam. 23:1-5 (expanded with the motif of fearful inaction), and less clearly in Jgs. 20:18-35 and I Sam. 30:7 ff.[30] The whole narrative can be rounded off with a concluding summary statement (I Chron. 14:17; I Sam. 23:5; Jgs. 20:36). Although the name tradition in I Chron. 14:11 is inseparable from this structural context, it is clearly a minor motif outside the main thematic lines. It is related to them only as a consequence of the conventional conclusion to the narrative, i.e., the victory over the threatening armies. The etymology itself is based only on material given in vs. 11. If these judgments are correct, one can view the name tradition, which on account of the stereotype Form II structure must encompass all of vs. 11, as a distinctive building block in the larger conventional narrative sequence.

---

[28] A similar pun on a place name may be extant in Ugaritic in 3 Aqht:8 which reads:
. . . qrt ablm
ablm (qrt zbl yrḫ)
". . . city of mourners, Ablm city of prince YRḪ."

[29] Cf. Rothstein and Hanel, *Das Erste Buch der Chronik* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1927), vol. I, pp. 264 f. Also E. L. Curtis, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Books of Chronicles* (New York: Scribners, 1910), pp. 208 f.

[30] Cf. further von Rad, *Der Heilige Krieg im Alten Israel* (Zurich: Zwingli, 1951), pp. 6 ff.

The characteristics of Form II simplest report appear in vs. 11. The locale is identified, anticipating the name;[31] events are reported (victory and a speech on that occasion), and the inference to the name made. The conclusive clause is impersonally formulated, since the Chronicler frequently employs the third masculine plural verb in this way,[32] and since the plural has no clear reference to a definite antecedent. The causal link between event (speech) and name is clear in the double assonance.

The material however shows its greater complexity in its highly integrated structure. The basis for the name does not lie in a mere report of an event. Rather the name is derived from a speech which must be understood as a response to the previously reported victory. In short, the situation in which the name might arise (victory) also motivates the speech and therefore is a presupposition for understanding the inference to the name. The series of waw conversive yiqtal verb forms also in this case shows the unity of the whole piece. The contrast, moreover, between this narrative style and the etymological formula sharply defines the latter's inferential function in the midst of recitation.

---

[31] Probably read with two MSS, all Greek MSS, and Syriac the singular ויעל for MT ויעלו .

[32] Kropat, Syntax, p. 7.

The analysis and conclusions for the parallel account in II Sam. 5:20 do not differ substantially. One need only note that the translation of the formula here is less surely to be made with an indefinite subject. The Greek MSS are uniform in reading for MT על־כן קרא , aorist passive διɑ τουτο εκληθη . But this in itself is of little help, since the LXX consistently reads in II Sam. the aorist passive for every etymology regardless of whether MT has על־כן קרא(ו) or ויקרא את־שם or Niph קרא (2:16; 5:9, 5:20; 6:8, 12:28. The only exception is 12:28). The most that can be claimed is that the inferential function of Form II is somewhat blurred by the ambiguity in the grammar. Yet the formal aspects of this passage follow so closely the usual pattern that one should not see a basic alteration in the etymological form.

3. Jgs. 18:12

Since the period of Wellhausen,[33] the dominant literary critical approach to Jgs. 17-18 has been to see here a narrative composed of two sources, whether J or E or simply "older" and "younger."[34] The question is still debatable, and more recently the one-source-plus-expansions theory has been revived again with force.[35] In any case, both from a literary critical and history of traditions point of view, the etiological etymological material in 18:11 f. appears at best a minor element in the wider context. The location which receives a name in fact is only an interim stopping place on the way to the main conquest (18:27 ff.; cf. vs. 13). Moreover, the explanation of the name requires nothing more than is given in vss. 11 f.[36]

---

[33] Composition, pp. 227 f. He saw one basic stratum with all sorts of interpolations.

[34] Cf. such commentaries as G. Moore, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Judges (New York: Scribners, 1895); K. Budde, Das Buch der Richter (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897); D. W. Nowack, Richter, Ruth und Bucher Samuelis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1902); O. Eissfeldt, Die Quellen des Richterbuches (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925); C. A. Simpson, Composition of the Book of Judges (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957).

[35] H. W. Hertzberg, Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1953), pp. 237 ff. Cf. now M. Noth, "The Background of Jgs. 17-18" in Israel's Prophetic Heritage (Essays in honor of James Muilenberg, ed. Bernard Anderson [New York: Harper and Row, 1962]), pp. 68 ff.

[36] Literary critics agree in keeping vss. 11 f. essentially in one stratum. Cf. the commentaries. Noth, Pentateuch, p. 70, speaks of an "etiological note."

Verse 12 alone exhibits the characteristic features of the simplest Form II report. An event is reported, along with its location (vs. 12a) and the inference (formulated with indefinite subject) is drawn.[37] Typically, the assonance between the name and the verb used in the reported event makes clear the logical link between narration (note coordinate style ויעלו and ויחנו) and inference.

Yet the sense of the name is not given completely in vs. 12. The setting reported in vs. 11, with its image of a large group arrayed for war, and the identification of this company with the Danites, is organically related to vs. 12. The descriptive vocabulary is commensurate with both the motif of "camping" and the military flavor of מחנה in the name.[38] Moreover, the connection of the place with the Danites, as reflected in the name itself and crucial to its explanation, is made explicit only insofar as vs. 11 functions to identify the agents for the ensuing action.

Thus the whole piece is built integrally as a simple report. To the basic structure of Form II has been added a rather detailed setting which provides information necessary to the sense of the inferred name. Obviously in this case the basis for the inference does not rest in merely one element of the report. Rather, the narrator draws a conclusion which is indicated by the action reported as well as information supplied by the descriptive setting.

---

[37] The phrase הנה אחרי קרית יערים is likely a gloss, since it differs slightly from the location given in vs. 12a.

[38] Cf. Ex. 14:19 f.24; Jos. 6:11.14.23; 10: 5 f.15; 11:4 (cf. 11:5); Jgs. 7:9 ff. *et al*.

4. Developed report and/or scene

a. Overview

The occurrences of Form II grouped here have to do with names of places (Gen. 19:22; 21:31) and a spring (Jgs. 15:19). These formulae differ from each other only insofar as their respective context includes conversation. But they all occur as a part of a narrative structure which shows clearly a dramatic movement from problem to solution (Jgs. 15:18 f.; Gen. 19:17-22) or analogously, proposal to agreed action (Gen. 21:22 ff.). Yet for all this thematic development, the essential inferential characteristics of simplest and simple Form II reports are preserved. All passages except Gen. 19:17-22 reflect an origin independent of their immediate contexts. It is not a question of merely subordinate motifs in a larger whole, but rather one of independent reports or scenes arising on the oral level quite separately from their present literary context.

b. The material

1. Jgs. 15:19

There is little doubt that vss. 18 f. preserve a local tradition whose origin was independent of the account of Samson's victory over the Philistines. The piece is complete in itself, adds nothing to the preceding narrative, and in no way depends upon it for its meaning.[39] Moreover, הערלים as a title is used only here in Judges, contrasting sharply with 15:1-17.20. Probably vss. 18 f. were related to the victory story because both blocks narrated events set at Lehi. Verse 20 stems from the Dtr redaction.[40]

The essential structural features of Form II are present in this unit. Events are reported as occurring at a particular locale. Though the name of the spring is not anticipated in vs. 19a, the phraseology (the hollow place at Lehi) leaves little doubt that the spot was definite and well known.[41] An inference to a name (not clearly formulated with an indefinite subject)[42] is then drawn on the basis of reported action. The logical link is accomplished through assonance (ויקרא vs. 18 and הקורא vs. 19b).

---

[39] Cf. Gressmann, Anfänge, p. 254; Nowack, Richter, pp. 130 ff.; Simpson, Composition, p. 60; Hertzberg, Josua, Richter, p. 231.

[40] Cf. the commentaries. Also cf. M. Noth, Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien (Tubingen: Niemeyer, 1943), p. 61, and more recently, W. Richter, Die Bearbeitungen des 'Retterbuches' in der Deuteronomischen Epoche (Bonn: Hannstein, 1964), p. 75.

[41] The word בלחי in vs. 19a has been interpreted as "in the jawbone," rather than the place name, "in Lehi." This does not seem likely, particularly in view of the etymological pattern which nearly always mentions a locale for the reported events.

[42] All Greek MSS, however, read aorist passive: δια τουτο εκληθη (one cursive MSS reads επεκληθη).

In terms of narrative structure, what is new is that the report moves through a dramatic sequence. The problem simply and abruptly stated in vs. 18 "and he was very thirsty," is finally resolved when God brings forth water in vs. 19a and he (Samson) is revived. The transition between problem and its solution is made with the pleas reported in vs. 18b. Hence these two verses are structured according to a design which moves toward a well defined goal; they merit a label of "developed report."

It is important to note that the inference to the name is based upon a crucial element in the thematic development. Yet the essential logical relationships found in the least complex examples of Form II are undisturbed here by the more expansive details provided in the movement from problem to solution. This fact is important in understanding the limitations imposed upon free creativity by the tenacity of a fixed etymological form.

2. Gen. 21:31

The text in Gen. 21:22-34 reflects in its disunity and irregularities a complex history of transmission. A covenant is reported twice (vss. 27b.32a); two gifts are presented to Abimelek (vss. 27a.28-30); two different puns on the place name seem to have been interwoven: שבע = "seven" (vss. 28. 29.30) and שבע = "oath" or "swear" (vss. 23.24.31). Moreover, vss. 33 f. are thematically quite unrelated to all this. Verse 34 particularly gives every appearance of stemming from a redactor.

In general, there are two distinctive thematic groupings of material. One speaks of a disagreement over water rights. Abraham initiates the action which leads to his presenting a gift to Abimelek as attestation of his rightful ownership of the disputed well (vss. 25 f.28-30). The second grouping centers on a concordat. Here Abimelek, not Abraham, initiates the action by calling for a kind of non-aggression pact, an "oath" (vss. 22-24). Presumably the conclusion to this affair is given in vss. 27 and 31, since the former cannot belong with the water strife tradition, and the latter is linked explicitly to the oath theme.[43]

Now the "oath-covenant" traditions (Block A = 22-24.27.31) most likely were preserved in the E document, since האלהים appears consistently here. But it is still debatable whether or not the other grouping (B Block = vss. 25-26.28-30) should be assigned to J.[44] It is possible, of course, that B is merely a variant, or perhaps just an expansion with an etymological interest on the primary "concordat" tradition. If both circles retain an important interest in explaining the name Beersheba, it is odd that only one stylized etymological formula is preserved, and this indissolubly linked with the A material (vs. 31).[45] Such a situation is best explained if the B tradition is an expansion on an already fixed concordat account. Moreover, the parallel tradition which connects the events with Isaac (Gen. 26:26 ff.) is the older, according to Noth.[46] Yet the material there knows nothing of a disputed well at Beersheba. Thus the question is at least open whether or not the B grouping in Gen. 21 is a secondary elaboration on the A tradition.

---

[43] Cf. von Rad, *Genesis*, pp. 230 ff.

[44] Cf. for example, Gunkel, *Genesis*, pp. 233 f., who speaks of E with a J variant. Skinner (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis* [New York: Scribners, 1910], pp. 214 ff.) and Speiser (*Genesis*, pp. 159 f.) attempted to read the account as a unified composition. This is impossible and leads the interpreter to supply speculative connections between the two traditions.

In any case, it seems reasonably certain on both literary and tradition history grounds that vss. 22-24.27.31 may be studied as an independent account. As such, the unit is a dramatic scene (there is conversation) consisting of four major divisions:

(1) Proposal for an oath: vss. 22 f.
(2) Response: vs. 24
(3) Report of covenant made: vs. 27
(4) Inference to a name: vs. 31 (Form II)

The typical characteristics of Form II are visible here. An inference to a name is formulated with an indefinite subject[47] and contrasts with the historical narrative movement preceding. The assonance between the name and the use of נשבע in the reported conversation (vss. 22b-24) makes clear the basis for the logical inference.

---

[45] The kî clause in vs. 31b undoubtedly links the whole verse with the "oath" motif. The judgment that in the history of this Form II, such explanatory clauses represent a secondary development, does not lead necessarily to the conclusion that a literary gloss has made the connection with the "oath" motif in this case. Indeed, the text gives no indication of literary disturbance at this point.

[46] Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 141 ff.

The scene is certainly a tightly knit and rounded off piece. The beginning is typically constructed (ויהי בעת ההוא cf. Gen. 26:32; 38:1; I Kings 11:29 *et al.*). It quickly provides a setting and a proposal to be acted upon. The movement from proposition to action, analagous to the way from problem to solution, constitutes the narrative. Yet the sparseness of actual third person narration in relation to the quoted conversation indicates that the emphasis rests upon the latter. It is not surprising, therefore, that the word plays, and hence the basis for the inference, appear conspicuously at this point. There can be little doubt that the etymology is integrally connected with the scene preceding.

One must reckon, however, with certain atypical features of this material. In the first place, the locale for the action is nowhere specified in the narrative preceding the name formula. This may be an unimportant omission. It may, however, indicate a shift from the clearest examples of a Form II report and a step toward mixing with the pattern of Form I. The omission raises at the same time another interesting question. The usual way of picturing etiological creativity is to see it as a speculative movement from a known (effect) to an unknown (cause).[48] If this be correct, then the absence of a specified location for the reported events may indicate that this movement from known to unknown has begun to break down and an increased interest in simple narration without etiological impetus is emerging.

---

[47] The use of third plural with definite subjects in vss. 27 and 31b makes it likely that the subject of singular *qr'* is indefinite rather than specifically Abimelek or Abraham. However, the LXX reads aorist.

Secondly, Form II appears here in an expanded form. A clause subordinated to the main conclusive formula by means of causal *kî* explicitly reports a basis for the inference to the name. The word play already noted between vss. 23 f. and the name is picked up with reference this time to an action only implied in the prior narration (vss. 24-27). The addition of the *kî* clause is surely secondary in the history of Form II.[49] (It is missing also in the older account in Gen. 26:33.) But if its appearance here is due to the influence of the established pattern of Form I, as Fichtner judges, then again one suspects that a mixed form is beginning to emerge.

---

[48] Cf. C. Westermann, "Arten der Erzählung in der Genesis" in *Forschung am Alten Testament* (*Gesammelte Studien*) (Munich: Kaiser, 1964), p. 43. Also M. P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion*, vol. I/2, pp. 25 ff. (Munich: Beck, 1941); L. Röhrich, *Märchen und Wirklichkeit* (second edition; Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964), pp. 27-36. Cf. above, p. 1 ff.

[49] Cf. above, p. 2ff. and Fichtner, *op. cit.*, p. 380.

These atypical features are important in showing the fluidity of the etymological material. In my opinion, they do not override the essential inferential relationship between narration and name. Thus one is justified in viewing Gen. 21:22-24.27.31 as a scene showing clear dramatic development, organically related to a Form II etymological conclusion, and functioning to provide the reason for a particular name.[50]

3. Gen. 19:17-22(23)

These verses are generally viewed by commentators as secondary intrusions into an older account of the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.[51] They break the continuity between vss. 16 and 24, contradict somewhat the sense and mood of the resolution point reached in vs. 16, and show a certain disturbance in the confusion over whether one (vss. 18b.19-22) or more (vss. 17a.18a) agents are speaking with Lot. Contrast vs. 19, which consistently uses singular address, with vs. 2 where Lot speaks in precisely parallel expressions and uses plural forms consistent with the number of addressees. (Cf. vss. 7.8.) Moreover, the etymological motif here is distinctly subordinate to the main thematic lines of 19:1-28.[52]

---

[50] The parallel account in Gen. 26:23-33 is discussed below as a fully developed narrative involving more than one scene.

[51] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 206; Procksch, Die Genesis (Leipzig: Deichert, 1924), p. 129; C. A. Simpson, The Early Traditions of Israel (Oxford: Blackwell, 1948), p. 78; Skinner, Genesis, p. 309.

As separate tradition, then, vss. 17-23 comprise a narrative scene with clear Form II characteristics. An inference to a name comes in vs. 22b. It is likely formulated with an indefinite subject, although certainty on this point is not forthcoming. In any case, על-כן makes the inferential function clear, if not absolutely free of narrative force. The contrast is apparent with the narrative tenses preceding the formula (ויאמר in vss. 17.18.21). The logical movement is typically expressed in the assonance between words in Lot's speech (vs. 20) and the name (vs. 22b). The absence of a specific mention of a locale here may not be important, since the inference does not rest upon an event at the place so named.

The passage is a tightly constructed unity. While it is not quite appropriate to speak of a dramatic tension reaching resolution (since the piece is nearly all conversation), there is a certain thematic movement from a command given along with a threatened disaster to a final stay in the execution of punishment along with a new command. Within this structure, the name is clearly inferred from a key element, i.e., Lot's plea (vs. 20). There is little doubt, then, that the whole scene functions as a unit to provide an explanatory base for the name.

---

[52] Cf. von Rad, Genesis, p. 215.

5. Narrative

a. Overview

The two passages classified here (Gen. 26:23-33; 11:1-9) bring a Form II etymological formula into organic relation to a narrative context consisting of at least two dramatic scenes. Otherwise, they show the essential pattern already discovered in less complex materials, and clearly function--in all their artistic development--to provide a basis for a particular name. Each narrative or story, although now in the J document, originated independently, and dealt with a place name.

b. The material

1. Gen. 26:33(J)

The pericope spanning vss. 23-33, while linked in the redaction to the preceding reports of well diggings (vss. 17 ff.), resists full assimilation to its literary position. The location changes (vs. 23), and the absence of a dispute motif separates it clearly in the history of traditions from the block in vss. 17-22. Surely vs. 34 is unrelated to this Beersheba tradition. Moreover, the covenant theme of vss. 26 ff. does not quite harmonize with the parting implied in vs. 16. Thus to all appearances, the Beersheba account originated quite independently of these surrounding Isaac traditions.[53]

---

[53] *Ibid.*, pp. 264 ff. Cf. also Noth, *Pentateuch*, pp. 114-118; 170 f.

Within the pericope, vss. 24-25a (theophany and altar building) are generally recognized as a later stage in the traditional development.[54] It is to be argued below that vss. 32-33a resulted from secondary expansion on the name etiology.[55] Thus the earliest visible stage of the tradition included vss. 25b-31.33b.[56] This complex, similar to the variant in Gen. 21, falls roughly into four main divisions:

Scene I

(1) Proposal for action: vs. 28

(2) Response: (report of feasting)

Scene II

(1) Action carried out: (report of oath made)

(2) Inference to a name

Characteristically for Form II the narrative movement ceases with על-כן and an inference is drawn to a name. This inferential function is not at all impeded by the absence of קרא .[57] The nominal phrase plus its adverbial modifier

---

[54] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 303; Noth, Pentateuch, p. 30. But cf. Skinner, Genesis, p. 366.

[55] Cf. below, p. 57ff.

[56] Verse 23 functions as a transitional piece and thus may stem from the redactor. (Cf. vs. 17.) Yet a location is normally given in the old altar-building report schema (cf. Gen. 12:7; 13:14 ff.; 35:6). On the other hand, a locale is usually given with Form II etymologies. Thus one cannot surely judge in which layer vs. 23 originally belonged.

[57] LXX^{A} has εκαλεσεν.

"as at this day" is best read in the general present. Consequently, its force as a logical conclusion is strengthened, and the contrast with the preceding coordinate recitation, sharpened (vs. 28 ויאמר vs. 30 ויעש ; ויאכלו ; וישתו). The inference, as the assonance indicates, is based directly upon the action reported in vs. 31 (וישבעו), and no doubt indirectly upon the complex of ideas associated with covenant making.[58] Hence a conclusion is drawn from a reported event (vs. 31) and from the substance of the whole piece.

Form II is part of a tightly structured whole. In two scenes, each marked by the passage of time, the dramatic movement from proposal to action is completed. Narrative details which do not seem essential to this thematic development (e.g., vss. 26 f. and 30) are clearly not on that account extraneous. Verses 26 f. not only provide a setting for the events to follow, but make an important connection to 26:16. And vs. 30, of course, records a typical feature of covenant ceremonies, i.e., the meal (cf. Gen. 31:54; Ex. 24:11). Most important, however, is the fact that the basis for the inference lies in a key element in the dramatic development. It is the very fulfillment of the opening proposal which leads logically to the particular place name. Clearly, therefore, the whole narrative functions as a unit to ground the name Beersheba.

---

[58] Cf. D. J. McCarthy, "Three Covenants in Genesis," CBQ 26 (1964), pp. 179 ff.

2. Gen. 11:9 (J)

Verses 1-9 clearly form a completed and rounded off narrative. But they have occasioned great debate on the question of source division.[59] Gunkel,[60] followed by others,[61] saw two parallel recensions, each containing an etiological motif. One told of building a tower in order to make a name (etiology on the city name Babel); the other spoke of building a city so as not to be dispersed throughout the earth (etiology on the diverse and scattered populations). What is clear after all is that there is now no satisfactory way to recover consistently these supposed versions. The city motif only with great difficulty can be separated from the tower theme in vss. 4 f. In the cuneiform traditions which lay in the formative background of the Genesis account,[62] tower (sanctuary) is already linked and even blurred with, the city of Babylon.[63] Moreover, vss. 8a and 9b form a very awkward, if not improbable, ending to a "city version." The difficulties cannot be solved on the literary level. It seems best to recognize the inconsistencies and diverse themes, and to accept the piece as an essentially unified product of long development ending with the fixing in one literary source, J.

---

[59] Cf. the summary in B. S. Childs, A Study of Myth in Genesis (part I of dissertation, Basel, 1955), pp. 94 f.

[60] Genesis, pp. 92 ff.

[61] E.g., Procksch, Genesis, p. 89; Skinner, Genesis, p. 224.

[62] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 94. Recently, E. A. Speiser, "Word Plays on the Creation Epic's Version of the Founding of Babylon," Orientalia 25 (1956), pp. 21 ff.

[63] Enuma Elish VI, lines 60 ff.72. Cf. the latest translation in J. B. Pritchard, Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (second edition, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1950), pp. 68 f.

In this way, the etymological etiology can be examined with due regard for the problems and limitations of defining a narrative context organically related to the name formula.

Some characteristic features of Form II are apparent, however. The על-כן clause clearly draws an inference. The singular subject of qr' can only refer to Yahweh in this context. But this is a highly unlikely reading. Therefore, the inference must be understood with an indefinite subject. Moreover, the על-כן clause marks a cessation of narrative movement, contrasting sharply with the string of waw conversives (vss. 1-8) which recite a series of successive events. The basis for the inference is made plain by the assonantal word play between Yahweh speech and name (vss. 7 and 9a). Finally, a locale is mentioned in the opening of the account, albeit rather vaguely specified (vs. 2).[64]

Despite the lack of cohesion in the whole narrative, certain general features parallel those found in more clearly defined Form II passages. There are two distinct scenes, marked by chronological and thematic shifts (vss. 1-4; 5-8). More importantly, a thematic sequence from proposed to thwarted action reaches its climax in Yahweh's direct action (vs. 8).

---

[64] The "land of Shinar" designates elsewhere a Babylonian area (Gen. 10:10 [J] Dan. 1:2).

But there are features atypical to Form II. First, the inference to a name is based upon the Yahweh speech presented as a response to the building activities of man (vs. 7). Yet the actual content of the speech somewhat resists its literary location, for its most direct reference is to the theme of one language (vss. 1.6a) rather than to the building motif dominant in vss. 2-5. Thus it is not quite appropriate to say that the name of the city is based upon a key element in the preceding narrative. Only insofar as the Yahweh speech now functions structurally as a direct response to the proposed action (vss. 3 f.) can one see it as a crucial part of the thematic development. Hence the problematic nature of the material immediately causes some qualification of the more typical integral relation between narrative and name.

Secondly, the name formula has been expanded with a kî clause in a way parallel to Gen. 21:31.[65] The focus of the word play is shifted, consequently, to a word descriptive of an act only implied in the preceding narrative. Thus the logical relationships are somewhat broadened. The inference draws upon a Yahweh speech as well as the implicit action following it. As mentioned in connection with Gen. 21:31, this addition of a *kî* clause may represent early signs of a blurring of the pattern with that of Form I.

---

[65] Cf. above, p. 30.

Viewed as a whole, it is clear that the force of the Form II structure was a significant factor in the shaping of this material. There is justification, therefore, for understanding its role in grounding a name to be at least equal in importance to other indigenous functions.

6. *Appendix*

Sufficiently positive evidence for isolating a particular narrative context for Form II is lacking in the case of Jos. 7:26. Most critics find an essentially unified block of tradition once the Ai material (vss. 2-5a) has been bracketed.[66] There are a few expansions, perhaps. But the dramatic movement from Yahweh's anger (vs. 1) to its abating (vs. 26a) is quite pronounced, and shows the essential unity of the whole piece.

The question remains, however, whether or not the name etymology is integral to the main traditions.[67] Certainly there are no serious grounds for suspecting a literary insertion here. But the text of vs. 26 is disturbing. For one thing, there appear to be preserved two divergent etiological motifs: a pile of stones and a place name. Elsewhere, whenever Form II (or Form I or a mixed form) occurs with the explicit mention of a permanent effect existing "until this day," it is the effect itself which receives a name. (Cf. for example, Jgs. 15:19; Jgs. 6:24.) Such is not the case in Jos. 7:26. Hence these two traditions were likely originally independent of each other, and subsequently fused.

---

[66] C. Steuernagel, *Das Deuteronomium und das Buch Josua* (second edition; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1923), pp. 175 ff.; G. Hölscher, *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Heidelberg: Winter, 1942), p. 340; Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (second edition; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953), pp. 43 ff.; Hertzberg, *Josua*, *Richter*, pp. 48 ff.; H. Holzinger (*Das Buch Josua* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901], pp. 19 ff.) leaves open the question between a one-source with-expansions view and a theory of conflated composite accounts. Gressmann, *Anfänge*, pp. 141 ff., defended two parallel accounts here.

Secondly, the central oracle in vss. 13-15 stipulates that the punishment for the violation of the ḥerem is to be by fire (vs. 15). Yet in the resolution of the account, execution by stoning has almost supplanted the "burning" motif (vs. 25). One wonders, therefore, whether the interest in stones might represent a secondary tradition.

Finally, the etymological material in vs. 26 actually involves only vs. 25 and the formula in vs. 26b. At best this can only express a minor theme in the whole. At the least, the situation raises the possibility that the name etiology is younger than the preceding story.

---

[67] Noth (Josua, pp. 43 ff.) argues that it is primary. Childs, JBL 82 (1963), p. 288, affirms exactly the opposite.

Obviously the evidence for the primary or secondary character of this etymological material is inconclusive. However, in terms of the established Form II patterns, something more can be suggested. There are some typical features. A locale, anticipating the name, is specified (vs. 24b); a speech is reported which by assonance forms the basis for an inference (with indefinite subject) to the name. Here, then, are the essential elements for simplest Form II. But they are now broken apart by vss. 25b-26a. Even assuming that the interest in the pile of stones is expressed in younger tradition, the simplest Form II structure is seriously disturbed by the report of burning, i.e., narrative material which reports the resolution to the tension raised in vss. 1 and 15. Moreover, the etymological elements comprise neither a simple nor a developed report. Nothing of an integrated unit, such as was evident in the study of Gen. 50:10b-11 or I Chr. 14:11, or a clear dramatic sequence as in Jgs. 15:18 f., can be made out of the name tradition alone. At every point one must go outside of vss. 25 f. to find structural elements which might provide an organic context for the etymological features. Just at this point, however, there are difficulties because the inference to the name is not based upon a crucial or necessary element in the overall thematic unit. This essential feature of a genuine etymological narrative is not visible here; the way from tension to resolution can be traversed without Joshua's execution speech in vs. 25.[68] Hence, the entire Achan tradition cannot be said to have originally provided a basis for the name of the valley, simply because the structural features which would indicate such a function are absent. One might even suppose that the etymological elements, given their lack of unity, are later accretions onto fixed traditions which served some other end.[69]

7. Summary and conclusions

The simplest occurrence of Form II reveals a fixed structure:

(1) Reported event

(2) Inference to a name based upon this report

Often, narrative material anticipates the name, and nearly always gives a specific location for the event. This functional connection between narration and name is constitutive. It remains essentially unaltered in a full range of complexity--from simplest report to genuine narrative.

The scope of narrative material which shows this organic link with an etymological formula is very limited. Never is Form II the focus of extensive traditions. The two most complex cases (Gen. 11:1-9 and 26:23-33) scarcely cover more than 10 verses. For the most part, the Old Testament texts preserve short reports which are clearly secondary, or at least subordinate, to a larger narrative complex.

---

[68] The issue is not whether vs. 25 is secondary to its context, but whether it is subordinate. Regardless of how one decides this question, it is clear that the speech is not a crucial step in moving from tension to resolution. Compare for example, the importance of Achan's confession (vs. 20) to the thematic development.

[69] The fact that the Greek (and parallels elsewhere) reads Achar for MT Achan does not argue necessarily for the originality of the etymological interest. It may indicate further development in the direction of more word play.

PART B. ETYMOLOGY OF FORM I TYPE

1. *Cases eliminated from the discussion*

a. A literary gloss in the text

Clearly Gen. 31:47[70] and Ex. 18:3[71] fall into this category. Matters are a bit more complex in Jgs. 6:32. The etymological formula tends in quite a new direction. Verse 31, with the catchword *rîb* used three times, portrays a challenge by Joash that Baal contend *for himself*. The result is never given. But vs. 32 presupposes that Baal has responded and contended *against Gideon*. Hence, vs. 32 cannot have been the original continuation of vs. 31. It is most likely a literary gloss since it is only very loosely related to the story preceding. If so, the oddly suspended clause in vs. 31, "for he broke down his altar," having no direct reference to its immediate context, is understandable as a bridge to the etiology on Jerubbaal.[72]

---

[70] Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 351 *et al*.

[71] If not a literary addition to the text, the γ elements of Form I (β is missing) are at least parenthetical and therefore only loosely set into the context. In any case, the formula is broken here. Gen. 27:36 probably should be seen as a broken form illustrating more than anything else a delight in word plays.

[72] So, W. Richter, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch* (Bonn:Hanstein, 1963), pp. 161 f. "At that time" may be the work of the redactor also.

b. The etymological interest is missing or obscure

This is the case in I Kings 9:13; II Kings 14:7; Gen. 35:15; Gen. 35:18;[73] and Jgs. 1:17.[74]

c. Problematic analysis

Five cases are included here: Gen. 21:3; Gen. 22:14; Gen. 32:31; Gen. 35:7; Ex. 17:7.

1. Gen. 21:3

Although Gen. 21:1-7 presents difficult problems for literary analysis, it seems most likely that a simplest report, with birth schema, lies in the background of a very complex and well sifted bit of tradition. A satisfactory division into sources has proved to be impossible,[75] not the least because of a baffling and inconsistent variation of divine names in the LXX.[76] Clearly, vss. 4 f. stem from P (cf. Gen. 17:9-14). Probably vs. 3 is from the priestly source because of the precision with which it is formulated. But the doublets in 1a//1b and 6//7 cannot be surely distributed among the literary documents. Although vss. 6 and 7 appear to report two different motivations for the name Isaac, this fact alone may only suggest traditional piling up of etymological word plays, perhaps in light of the material found in 18:12. In any case, the verses less the P strains present a fragmentary birth report with an etymological etiology, but this only as a composite literary piece comprising vss. 1.2.6f. which no longer has preserved a simple report of birth. A smooth, early stage of tradition is not forthcoming.

---

[73] Cf. the commentaries for various attempts at reconstructing the significance of the name, Benjamin. In the case of vs. 18a, (Ben-'oni), since a כי element is missing, the understanding turns on the elements in the name itself. But its meaning is highly uncertain. One possibility: "my virility" (cf. Gen. 49:3; Dt. 21:17; Ps. 78:51 // 105:36). Second possibility: a sense of calamitous event or deep sorrow (cf. Dt. 26:14) from the root אנה "mourn" (Isa. 3:26; 19:8. Cf. Ugaritic un in texts 67:VI:15; I Aqht:40.). Third possibility: a form of אָוֶן, thus linking up with concepts of magic and evil powers.

[74] The narrative elements present in a parallel passage, Num. 21:1-3, have been covered in Jgs. 1:17 by the historian's style of report. A remnant of an etymological etiological formula probably remains in the word play. Yet the report of the city name now appears as a digression (cf. vss. 20.21.23. 26). To all appearances, any interest in explaining the name has receded in favor of making the overall reporting accurately reflect any changes in names (cf. vss. 10.11.23 et al.).

[75] Cf. Gunkel's attempt, Genesis, pp. 226 f. and p. 272, and various disagreements among subsequent commentators. Procksch, Genesis, pp. 137 ff.; Driver, Genesis, pp. 209 f.; Speiser, Genesis, pp. 153 f.

2. Gen. 22:14

As the text in this passage is now vocalized, an allusion is probably made to vs. 8 where a similar expression appears. But the relative clause of vs. 14 has quite another tendency. Not only does the vocalization יֵרָאֶה obscure any allusion to vs. 8, but the formulation of the clause is suited to a proverbial saying (יֵאָמֵר cf. Gen. 10:9; Num. 21:14) rather than a place name as expected from vs. 14a, the typical β element of Form I. Therefore vs. 14b cannot be the original γ element belonging with vs. 14a; the form has been broken. Moreover, a genuine place name may not even survive here. יהוה יראה looks like an explanation for a now lost name.[77]

---

[76] Vs. 2 κυριος for MT אלהים, but in vs. 4 θεος for MT אלהים. Yet vs. 6, κυριος again for MT אלהים. The use of κυριος for אלהים is, of course, not unknown elsewhere. Cf. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. G. Kittel, vol. III, p. 1059. Yet fluctuations in a rather limited bit of tradition may point to a complex history of the Hebrew text more than to translation idiosyncrasies in the Greek.

3. Gen. 32:31

In the case of Gen. 32:31, Elliger[78] has convincingly argued that a thorough source analysis for Gen. 32:23 ff. is impossible. Behind the J document lies an obscure and complicated history of oral transmission which is now reflected in the roughness of the narration. The etymological formula strangely floats in its context; its γ element seems appropriate to a theophany (cf. Gen. 16:13; Jgs. 6:22) while the narrative material of the context does not clearly relate such. Thus a reasonably well defined narrative context for Form I is not forthcoming. Verse 31 may even be a secondary addition to the literary form of the pericope.

4. Gen. 35:7

Gen. 35:1-7 (verse 7 has Form I) gives every appearance of having been secondarily linked up with the circle of Jacob stories. Alt clearly delineated the character of an older layer of pilgrimage tradition in which Shechem and Bethel were bound together (vss. 1-4).[79] If one must understand the present form of the text as the fulfillment of the vow uttered in 28:20 ff., one must see also that the connections are implicit rather than explicit (vss. 1.3). And there is no mention of the tithe of 28:22. Moreover the verses 1-7, especially vss. 5 ff., lack the cohesion necessary in an originally connected narrative. Verse 5, for example, appears to link the material to the Dinar traditions of chapter 34, but is unrelated to vss. 1-4 (the third plural subject of רדפו has no clear reference) or to vss. 6 ff.[80] Accordingly, the motivation (ע element) given for the name in vs. 7 is not related to anything reported in the immediately preceding verses. Rather, it is secondary and stems from the redactional linkage made with the Jacob stories.[81]

---

[77] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 239, in fact reconstructs the lost place name.

[78] "Der Jakobskampf am Jabbok," ZthK 48 (1951), pp. 1-31.

5. Ex. 17:7

About all that can be decided by literary criticism in this block (vss. 1-7) is that 1bb'-2 // vs. 3, and that vss. 1a-1ba' stem from the P redactor.[82] Some critics have joined vs. 7 with 1bb'-2 because of the common occurrence of *rîb*. Yet the whole לאמר clause of vs. 7 has no clear reference to the narrative material. At best, a fragment containing a name tradition remains (vss. 1bb'-2.7?). Certainly this is not enough to justify any conclusions.[83]

---

[79] Cf. A. Alt, "Die Wallfahrt von Sichem nach Bethel" in Kleine Schriften, vol. I (Munich, 1953-59), pp. 79 ff.

[80] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 378 f. He also characterizes the whole as "redactional work," a "loosely piled heap."

[81] Cf. Noth, Pentateuch, p. 87; von Rad, Genesis, pp. 331 ff.

2. *Form I report*

a. Overview

The very simplest examples of etymological report, of course, are those in which the full Form I is disassociated from any kind of narrative setting. Two passages fit this category: Gen. 3:20 and I Chron. 4:9.[84].

The other occurrences of clear Form I show only a minimal narrative context. They appear in J, E, or JE layers of Genesis, and mostly report the naming of a child at birth. The formula in such cases occurs as a part of a narrative schema which itself can assume, in general, three forms:[85]

---

[82] Cf. the major commentaries, especially Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 138 ff.

[83] Noth (*Pentateuch*, p. 135, n. 348) is unsure whether or not the name etymology belongs to the oldest layer of the tradition.

[84] There are two cases in which a name etymology is given as a part of a birth prediction (Gen. 16:11 and I Chron. 22:9). To this group must be added Gen. 17:5 which has the Niphal of *qr'*. These passages have in common the fact that something like Form I appears in a speech delivered in the imperative mode. The particular name is grounded only in the *kî* explanatory clause (Gen. 16:11) or a feature in the speech itself (I Chron. 22:9; Gen. 17:5). There is no question of narrative elements being organically related to the formula.

A. Narrative: birth (and conception often) reported
Form I (naming and explanation)

B. Narrative: birth (and conception often) reported
Note on peculiar characteristics or circumstances
Form I (naming)

C. Narrative: birth (and often conception) reported
Saying (usually of the mother)
Form I (naming; no γ element)

A large number of examples are found in one block of tradition: Gen. 29:32.33; Gen. 30:8.11.13.18.20.24.[86] Elsewhere: Gen. 4:25; 5:29; 41:51.52. Other examples of Form I, with very restricted narrative, report place names: Gen. 26:32-33a and I Sam. 7:12.

The characteristic feature of all the passages with minimal narration is that the narrative material outside the formula functions neutrally with respect to Form I. It in no way suggests or motivates the name to be given, but rather provides an appropriate setting in which a name may arise. The formulaic structure shows the typical characteristics of Form I summarized above. Briefly, the elements of the simplest report are the following:

---

[85] Fichtner, *op, cit.*, p. 381, note 2. Occasionally a birth and naming is reported without the etymology (cf. Gen. 4:17a; 35:18b; 30:21) or with an obscure word play (e.g. probably Gen. 38:30. Cf. on this passage, F. Zimmermann, "The Births of Perez and Zerah," *JBL* 64 [1945], pp. 337 f.).

[86] Strictly speaking, Gen. 29:34.35; 30:6 show a mixed form. These are treated in detail in a separate discussion.

(1) Setting

(2) Naming (Form I with β and γ elements, or β alone, in which case the motivation with word play precedes the name)

b. The material

In the case of Gen. 3:20, the full formula appears. The explanation of the name is given solely in the typical assonantal word play within the formulaic structure. If there ever existed a narrative setting for this note, it is no longer visible, for the verse ill fits the place given it in the present literary block.[87] In any case, this example represents the very simplest way of reporting an etymological etiological tradition. The narrative function of the formula is prominent here. The definite subject of ויקרא and the absence of narrative material rule out understanding the Form I to be drawing an inference.

In I Chron. 4:9, Form I appears as one of a series of loosely joined reports regarding Jabez (vss. 9a.9b.10).[88]

---

[87] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 23; von Rad, Genesis, p. 93 *et al.*

[88] קראה appears instead of ותקרא in the formula.

Narrative continuity can only be read into the text.[89] Assonance is sounded in the β and γ elements. Again, the narrative force of Form I is clear. The thrust lies in reporting the naming and supplying a reason for it.

In Gen. 29:31-30:24, the redactor has provided a very general narrative framework by using conventional motifs (strife between wives, 29:31; 30:9; a barren wife; gaining of children by a slave).[90] These motifs are not integral to one name giving situation, but function as a vague context for a whole series of birth reports. Hence the various etymologies are able to stand quite independently of this framework (29:32.33; 30:8.11.13.20.24). Even the more developed narrative material in 30:14-16 is very roughly joined to a name etiology (in vss. 17-18) which reports a birth and a name whose explanation goes in quite a surprising direction.[91] Thus, the birth schema in these two verses seems independent of the "mandrake story." What is visible in the larger block (Gen. 29:31-30:24) are a number of birth schemata, likely deriving from both J and E sources, loosely linked together, and standing quite independent of the narrative material outside the schemata themselves.

---

[89] Cf. for example, Curtis, Chronicles, p. 107 and earlier, Immanuel Benziger, Die Bücher der Chronik (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901), p. 15.

[90] Cf. the commentaries for the source analysis. A recent attempt at history of tradition: S. Lehming, "Zur Erzählung von der Geburt der Jakobssöhne," VT 13 (1963), pp. 74-81.

[91] Verses 14-16 are usually assigned to J, vss. 17-18 to E. Cf. the commentaries.

Gen. 4:25, which follows abruptly on Lamech's speech, is linked to the prior literary context only by עוד and a reference to the Cain-Abel story.[92] The piece, a birth schema A., is remarkable for its complete lack of relationship to the surrounding traditions. The subject of Adam's offspring is disturbing in the context of a listing of the distant descendants of Cain (4:17 ff.), and certainly separate from the new genealogy beginning in 5:1. Therefore, 4:25 probably should be seen as a fragment of a variant genealogical tradition, which by nature shows only minimal narrative characteristics (cf. Gen. 5:6 ff. and 4:17-22) and which often includes a birth schema. In this sense, 4:25 is comparable to 5:29, another passage classified as simple Form I report. Both verses are independent of narrative material outside the schematic framework.

Gen. 41:50-52 are generally taken as a later insertion into the original Joseph story of chapter 41.[93] Birth schema A. is visible here, although the report of the birth itself varies slightly from the usual pattern. Form I[94] (vss. 51.52) shows no clear relationship to narrative material outside the schema. The birth tradition is a remark germaine to the theme of Joseph's rise in fortune, but hardly an original part of the story surrounding it.[95]

---

[92] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 54, and generally among commentators.

[93] Ibid., p. 439. Cf. Skinner, Genesis, p. 471; P. Volz and W. Rudolph, Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik? (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1933), p. 159; lately, L. Ruppert, Die Josepherzählung der Genesis (Munich: Steiner, 1965), pp. 70 and 86 f.

In all these examples (in Gen. 29 and 30; 4:25; 5:29; 41:51 f.), the β element of Form I simply reports the giving of a name. As in the cases of the simplest occurrence of the Form I (Gen. 3:20; I Chron. 4:9), the γ elements--when they appear--are grammatically subordinate to the report of name giving (Gen. 4:25; 5:29, 41:51.52; 29:32). Following the narration of the giving of the name, the γ element refers for the first time to the event (in these cases a speech) which is logically prior to the act of naming, and which gives rise to the name itself. This causal relation is clear because γ contains a subordinating expression (כי or לאמר) and a key word which is assonant with the name given to the child.[96] The substance of the word play varies, however. In three instances the key word is a verb describing a divine action (4:25; 41:51.52); once it is the direct result of divine action (29:32); once a verb descriptive of the future role of the child (5:29). Such variations only illustrate the nearly inexhaustible range of possibilities open to the story teller.

---

[94] Verse 52 is modified because of the close relationship with the preceding verse. The qatal verb functions as a historical tense just as does the ויקרא normally.

[95] Cf. von Rad, Genesis, p. 373.

[96] The distinctive subordinating functions of kî as a causal conjunction and as a particle introducing direct discourse, have merged in Gen. 41:51.52; 4:25. Gen. 5:29 has לאמר . Gen. 29:32 preserves a purely causal kî.

The remaining seven cases of Form I (29:33; 30:8.11. 13.18.20.24) occur as a part of birth schema C. Hence a speech which gives rise to the name and which contains a key word assonant with the name, is reported before the act of naming. These quoted speeches substitute for a γ element insofar as they report the motivation for a particular name. There is a significant variation, however. The quoted speeches of schema C. are not grammatically subordinate to the report of the name giving. Rather, they have a syntactically independent status, for the saying uttered at the time of birth is reported alongside other narrative material in a simple coordinate style. This means that the causal link between speech and name is not explicit in the syntax. It is clear only in the word play.

Outside of the name formula, the birth schema provides a bare narrative context. For example, in Gen. 29:32a, conception and birth are reported immediately prior to the etymological formula: "And so and so conceived and bore a son (daughter) . . . ." This is the common pattern when β and γ elements appear (Gen. 4:25; 5:29; 41:50 ff.) or when γ is replaced by a speech (Gen. 29:33; 30:7.10.12.17.19.23).

Sometimes this minimal context is slightly elaborated by reporting events prior to the birth (30:17.22), or circumstantial details (5:28; 41:50a). In all cases, it is clear that the central event reported is the birth. All else either leads to this event, or flows from it as a direct consequence. The significant point, however, is that this simple narrative material merely provides a setting for the etymological etiological formula. The report, exclusive of the β and γ elements of Form I does not suggest the name to be given. Rather, it reports a situation--and a fitting one at that--[97] in which the name, and therefore its explanation, can arise. One can put the matter otherwise. The context which lends significance to the name given is encompassed entirely by the limits of Form I. The whole, however, is placed in a commensurate setting comprising the wider narrative elements of the birth schema.

Two other passages, which report the naming of places rather than newly born children, illustrate further these general conclusions: Gen. 26:32-33a and I Sam. 7:12.

---

[97] In the Ugaritic epics, the motifs of birth and naming are joined together. Cf. text 75:I:28; less clear, 6:30 ff. Older Semitic names in fact seem to reflect the immediacy of the birth situation. Cf. J. J. Stamm, Die Akkadische Namengebung (Leipzig: Deichert, 1939), prgr. 3, pp. 8 ff. All this suggests that the report of a birth provides a natural and familiar context for an explanation of a person's name.

1. Gen. 26:32-33a

While there are no serious grounds for suspecting the presence of two literary sources in the larger block Gen. 26:23-33,[98] verses 32-33a seem to reflect a later stage in the growth of the tradition.[99] The following considerations support this judgment:

(a) Verse 32 begins an entirely new report quite unrelated to the preceding story of covenant making. Its only point of contact with the foregoing material is with the last phrase of vs. 25, which in itself is but an incidental note. One might also observe that vs. 31 sounds rather like an ending (cf. Gen. 32:1; Num. 24:25; Gen. 21:32b). The phrase, moreover, in vs. 32 marks a new turn in the narration, and indeed often signals a separate layer of tradition (cf. Gen. 15:18; 48:20. But see, to the contrary, Gen. 30:35 and 33:16.).

(b) The variant of this saga (Gen. 21:22-33) agrees in setting the events narrated in Beersheba

---

[98] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 299 f.; Speiser, Genesis, p. 198 et al.

[99] Already the promise motif (vss. 24 f.) has been recognized as a later development. Cf. Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 58 ff. and Westermann, Forschung, pp. 11 ff. and 26.

(cf. Gen. 26:23.33b and 21:31.32).[100] Therefore, the original tradition is most likely to have been associated with only one place name. Consequently, a second name שבעה, however it is vocalized, would seem to result from a secondary development.

(c) The likelihood of the presence of variant tradition is suggested by the difficulty which the versions reflect in translating שבעה in vs. 33a. LXX gives ορκος implying Hebrew שְׁבֻעָה (cf. Gen. 21:31). Some others, notably Syriac and Vulgate, imply שִׂבְעָה "abundance," attested in Ezek. 16:49 שִׂבְעַת לֶחֶם. L. Köhler[101] takes MT שִׁבְעָה, to mean "abundance" and thus sides with the versions against the LXX.[102]

---

[100] Perhaps Gen. 46:1 ff. reflect another variant. If so, the location is again given as Beersheba.

[101] L. Köhler in ZAW n.f. 14 (1937), p. 166.

[102] Cognates in Ugaritic: šbʿt "satiety" and the verb šbʿ which refer frequently to drunkenness: 2 Aqht II:6.20; 2 Aqht I:32. The Accadian verb šebû, "be sated," is used with reference to food and drink, and frequently in the context of rains and floods. (C. Bezold, Babylonisch-Assyrisches Glossar [Heidelberg, 1926], pp. 263 ff.). The noun šbʿ appears in eighth century Phonecian (Karatepe) in the sense of general prosperity or "plenty." Cf. in Donner and Röllig, Kanaanäische und Aramäische Inschriften (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1962-64), vol. I, text 26 A: III, 7.9 and IV., 7.9. The phrase is בעלת שבע ותרש - "proprietress of plenty and wine."

One cannot exclude the possibility that ויקרא אתה שבעה is merely a glossing variant upon the preceding story of an oath, especially in light of the etymological word play in the parallel account Gen. 21:31. If this were the case, however, the problem of vs. 32, which is completely unmotivated by the preceding material, is left unsolved. Understanding שבעה as "satiety" or "abundance" at least has the virtue of explaining the presence of vs. 32 in its present place, for the latter can provide the motivation for this particular name. It seems most likely that a variant name tradition, which takes the form of a simplest report, has somehow come into the Beersheba account.

(d) Two etymological formulae appear in vs. 33.[103] Etymological motifs are known to pile up (cf. Gen. 30:23 f.; 22:14 for example), although there are no other examples of Form I and II standing side by side (but cf. Gen. 32:30.32; 2:23.24). The fullness in this verse is likely not due to a combination of literary sources, since a connected second source cannot be detected in the whole account. Rather, the presence of two distinct formulae is more likely explained as accretion of variant tradition.

---

[103] There are no γ elements, but their omission is fairly frequent in mixed forms. The verb qr', usually in Form II, is absent in MT, although present in LXX^{A} and Syriac versions. Commentators are split over which is the original text. Even without the verb, the על-כן phrase functions more as the classic Form II than Form I.

Now if שבעה is rightly understood as "abundance" or "satiety" then it is clear that vs. 33a along with vs. 32, rather than Form II (vs. 33b), is in the later layer of the tradition, since the water motif has a very minor place in the whole complex.[104] Furthermore, in all occurrences of Form II, על-כן draws an inference from an immediately preceding event or speech in a given situation.[105] Now in the passage under examination, vss. 32-33a break the pattern, putting unrelated material between premise and conclusion (Form II). Therefore, vss. 32-33a are secondary.

Considering vss. 32-33a a secondary tradition, therefore, one lays bare a variant report containing typical elements: neutral setting (servants deliver a message);[106] speech (the message); naming (Form I without a γ element). The characteristics of the simplest etymological etiological report are now evident. The setting (vs. 32a through חפרו) merely provides a situation--like the birth report--in which the name may arise. A quoted speech substitutes for a γ element and directly motivates the name. The word play which makes this causal relationship clear, however, is not one of assonance. Instead, the name taken as a substantive expresses an appropriate and nearly equivalent response to the substance of the servants' message.

---

[104] Some further confirmation lies in the fact that Form I originally seems to have been restricted to personal names, and Form II to place names (Fichtner, *op. cit.*, p. 383). Since the Form I type in vs. 33a is linked with a place name, its usage here may reflect a secondary development over against a Form II which retains its original usage.

[105] Cf. above, p. 3ff.

2. I Sam. 7:12

This verse apparently is one piece with the foregoing material stemming from the Dtr historian.[107] Like much of the material in this block (vss. 2-17), verse 12 retains some of its originalindependence. It lies outside the thematic development visible in vss. 2-13. Striking confirmation appears in the fact that the verse interrupts the stereotyped schematic conclusion to the Dtr victory summary. The customary formula occurs in Jgs. 3:29.30; 4:22.23; 8:28; 11:33, and belongs to the redactor's framework.[108] Typically a summary victory is reported and followed by a concluding statement: "And Yahweh (God) subdued (כנע) so and so on that day. . . ." Now in I Sam. 7, this schema appears in vss. 1 and 13, and is clearly broken by an intruding name etiology. Moreover, עד־הנה in the direct motivation for the name, tends in a direction which ill fits the context provided by vss. 10 f.[109]

---

[106] This statement may possibly be linked to the last phrase of vs. 25; the connection, however, is not smoothe, since vs. 32 implies that Isaac knew nothing of a well, and vs. 25 has the well dug at the very spot where Isaac built the altar. The similarity of this well report with the series of traditions in 26:18-22 should be noted. The latter, however, form a unit with a certain climax. Hence there was no original connection to vss. 32-33a.

[107] Cf. the commentaries. Lately, Noth, Studien, pp. 54 ff.

As an originally independent bit of tradition,[110] vs. 12 provides another example of the simplest etymological etiological report. A neutral setting is given (vs. 12a) along with a full Form I which displays the typical word play between β and γ elements.[111]

To sum up; the simplest and clearest examples of Form I appear simply as formulae (Gen. 3:20; I Chron. 4:9) structured so as to report a naming, a name, and its reason. The creation of a Form I report alters this structure in no essential way. A commensurate setting is provided for the name to be given. The latter is narrated and its reason reported, but is never suggested by the narrative setting itself. Put most sharply, Form I shows no functional connections with the narrative material surrounding it.

---

[108] Cf. Richter, Bearbeitungen, pp. 3 ff.

[109] Many commentators emend the text to עֵדָה הִוא כי on the strength of Gen. 31:48 and Jos. 24:27. There is, however, no manuscript support for this reading. Cf. S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text . . . of the Books of Samuel (second edition; Oxford: Clarendon, 1960), p. 65.

[110] Noth, Studien, p. 56, note 3, definitely understands the matter this way.

[111] The γ element, instead of being subordinated to β, is a coordinate sentence with ויאמר. The word play, however, removes any doubt as to its function; it expresses the motivation for the name.

PART C. ETYMOLOGY OF A MIXED TYPE

1. Overview

Since Form II, at its simplest, is intrinsically related to narrative material, and since Form I shows no such functional connection, it is not surprising that in cases in which the traditions are more complex, a certain mixing of Form I and II characteristics develops.[112] There are a surprising number of mixed cases (twenty-one in all). The mixing occurs in both old and very young literary strata, and is nearly equally distributed among person and place name traditions. The passages show a wide variation in the degree of mixing; they range from cases in which narrative material as in Form II reports is organically linked to an etymological formula otherwise like Form I, to occurrences in which the distinctions between the two forms are almost completely lost. Most of the time it is Form I which has been associated with narrative structures similar to various types of Form II material, and which has in the process been altered in its formulaic structure and function.

2. The material

a. Cases of slight mixing

The breakdown of the Form I pattern is visible in a few passages where the typical neutral narrative material is replaced or supplemented by narration integrally related to the simple report of a name giving. As a consequence, the narrative force of the conventional ויקרא or ותקרא is made more ambiguous, and something of inferential על-כן קרא barely begins to be felt.

---

[112] Cf. Fichtner, op. cit., p. 383. He theorized that originally Form I and II were used in quite different circumstances.

1. I Chron. 7:21 ff.

The Ephramite genealogy is constructed according to the conventional pattern: simple identification of the family, followed by a listing of descendents. (Cf. Gen. 10:2 ff.; I Chron. 2:5 ff.; 2:25 ff.; 7:2; 7:3 ff.) Special narrative traditions about specific persons or tribal affairs and customs are easily detected and their limits defined. (Cf., for example, I Chron. 2:23, 4:9 f.; 4:39 ff.; Gen. 36:24.) Thus in the case of I Chron 7:21 ff., one can separate out vss. 21b-23, beginning with the mention of Ezer and Elead, as special narrative tradition, still in the style of a report, but clearly interrupting the regular cataloguing of offspring. This judgment likely explains the curious fact that neither Ezer, Elead, nor Beriah are known in the parallel genealogy in Num. 26:35 ff. The independent name report, then, may be analyzed as follows:

(a) Setting (raiding of cattle)
(b) Report: The slaying of the two sons (vs. 21b)
(c) Reaction reported:
    (1) Mourning (vs. 22)
    (2) Birth schema (with Form I) (vs. 23)

The typical relationships between the β and γ elements of Form I are visible here in vs. 23. The report of conception and birth do not suggest the name to be given; Form I is comprehensible in itself and its narrative force is clear. Some manuscripts and versions even read ותקרא. Now the γ element, as quotation,[113] directly motivates the name. Yet its sense is filled out insofar as the γ element is a commensurate descriptive response to the main event reported outside the birth schema, namely, the slaying of the two sons. The association of רעה with this type of event is neither unusual nor accidental. Jgs. 9:56-57; 20:12; Ex. 32:12 show that רעה may appear naturally in the context of הרג. I Kings 14:10 associates רעה with the loss of offspring. Hence the association in I Chron. 7:21 ff. explicitly links the name, through its direct motivation, to a narrative element which is crucial to the integrity of the chain of events narrated. The narrative material outside the birth schema, then, is not simply neutral with respect to Form I, for it provides part of the reason for the given name. To this extent, the simple Form I pattern has been altered.

---

[113] The phrase כי ברעה היתה בביתו is incomprehensible unless kî introduces direct discourse. Therefore, read with LXX^{B}, for MT, ביתי.

2. Gen. 38:27-30

This block, though probably not a literary addition to the bulk of chapter 38, is somewhat independent of the dramatic development in vss. 1-26, which reaches its climax in a legal judgment (vss. 25 f. Cf. Jer. 3:11; Ezek. 16:52.).[114] The etymology of vs. 29 in no way depends upon the Judah-Tamar story for its sense. Rather, vss. 27-30 are clearly separate from chapter 39, and at best comprise an epilogue to the main narrative. Within the small unit, there are no indications of literary breaks. Indeed, the motifs of childbirth and naming (with etymology) mostly appear already joined together. It is likely, therefore, that vss. 27-30 formed an original tradition unit. However, the intended etymological point in vs. 30 is obscure.[115] Yet Form I in vs. 29, along with its narrative context (vss. 27-28), can be examined apart from any connection with vs. 30. This procedure, though admittedly unusual, and destructive of an artistic unity, is permissible only because vss. 27-29 upon analysis, yield a pattern analagous to the simple Form II report.

---

[114] Cf. H. J. Boecker, Redeformen des Rechtslebens in Alten Testament (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1964), pp. 127 f. There are also parallels to the literary device of following a dramatic resolution with a terse statement of its result. Cf. Jer. 28:16 f.; Dan. 5:26 f.

[115] Aramaic reconstructions which relate the name Zerah to the detail of "scarlet thread" are common. Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 419. Recently, Zimmermann in JBL 64 (1945), pp. 377 f.

A setting (vs. 27), which is not really neutral, creates the situation in which the name (perhaps originally both names) can arise. A speech (vs. 29a), substituting for a γ element,[116] directly motivates the name to be given. The motivation and name are linked typically by assonance.[117] Moreover, the speech-motivation is dependent upon the details of the birth report (vss. 28-29a) as well as the setting (fact of twins) for its sense. Thus the verses are a tightly constructed unit. One can say that the name is linked structurally, as opposed to word play, to important narrative features, and thus is similar to Form II. The inferential function constitutive of Form II, however, is lacking, though beginning to be felt.

3. Gen. 32:2-3

These verses clearly comprise an independent unit between the preceding Jacob-Laban tradition and the following account of Jacob's reconciliation with Esau. The inversion of subject and predicate in vs. 2 marks the abrupt change in subject matter. The piece contains the following constitutive parts:

---

[116] Reading with three MSS and versions ותקרא for MT ויקרא .

[117] The usual translation of עליך as "for yourself" is odd. Ordinarily one would expect the Hebrew to read לך . The causative sense of על may be present. Cf. Ps. 44:23; Gen. 16:5 (LXX here translates with εκ σου). Cf. other attempts in Zimmermann, *op. cit.*, p. 377, and A. Guillame, "Paronomasia in the Old Testament," *JSS* 9 (1964), pp. 282 ff.

(a) Report

(1) Meeting along the way

(2) Speech

(b) Naming

The γ element is absent, but as has been seen elsewhere, the speech immediately before the act of naming substitutes for γ by reporting in coordinate narrative style the motivation for the name. This is made clear by the paronomasia between מחנה and the place name מחנים .

The narrative material preceding the name formula is not, however, neutral. Jacob's speech, which occasions the name of the place, is an immediate response to the meeting. The fact that his utterance is formulated in language entirely commensurate with this event and clearly refers to it (זה), indicates the close relationship between the two narrated events. Thus three elements of the report (meeting, speech, naming) are indissolubly linked together. One sees that the name is tied directly by assonance to the motivation-speech. But the necessary context for understanding the speech is given only in vs. 2b. Therefore, the constitutive parts of vss. 2b-3 function together to report and explain the name given to the place. At least to this extent, Form I has given way to Form II.

4. I Sam. 4:19-22

This passage also shows an alteration in the pattern of Form I. Moreover, it appears at first glance to function etiologically (a full Form I occurs in vs. 21), but on closer examination reveals within its structure indications of an altogether different function. This latter may be corroborated independently by a study of the wider tradition context in chapters 4 and 5.

There is no question that vs. 19 begins a new thematic unit which extends to 5:1 where the reporting broken off in 4:11 is resumed. The opening of new scenes, and the closing of old, in this large complex are well marked by thematic shifts and grammatical inversions (4:11.18 [closing of a scene]; 4:19; 5:1 [openings]) and once by an introductory phrase (4:5). Now vss. 19-22 are unified literarily.[118] The only serious reason for doubt arises from the apparently double quotation in vs. 21ab' and vs. 22. But this has been discounted by many.[119] It is perhaps reasonable, as will be seen below, to view vs. 22 as a narrator's attempt at clarifying vs. 21.[120] Basically, however, vss. 19-21(22) remain a unified whole. One may assume that the unit's shape in oral tradition was not greatly different from its present literary form.

---

[118] The phrase in vss. 19b and 21, ומת חמיה ואישה has been taken as a gloss. Cf. for example, Gressmann, *Anfänge*, pp. 12.15 f. and W. Caspari, *Die Samuelbücher* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1926), p. 73; L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926), pp. 12 f., now reprinted in Rost, *Das Kleine Credo und Andere Studien zum Alten Testament* (Heidelberg: Quelle and Meyer, 1965), p. 128.

[119] Cf. for example, A. Ehrlich, *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908-1918), vol. III, p. 183. Recently, Hertzberg, *I and II Samuel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965; ET of German edition of 1956), p. 50.

[120] The LXX in vs. 21 appears not to have understood the word play in the name and hence translated from the context. Cf. P. de Boer, *Research into the Text of I Samuel 1-16* (Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1938), p. 51. The Greek and Hebrew of vs. 22 agree.

These verses comprise a report consisting of the following elements:

(1) Setting (vs. 19a)

(2) Report of birth

(a) Labor (vs. 19bb')

(b) Nurses' speech

(c) No answer

(3) Naming (Form I with β and γ elements) (vs. 21)

The β element narrates the name giving. The name's direct motivation is expressed by the γ element לאמר .... מישראל and the name Ichabod ("No glory") is understood as a commensurate descriptive response to the speech quoted in γ.[121] Now this speech itself receives an explicit motivation in the causative clause of vs. 21b: "because the ark of God had been captured, and because of her father-in-law and her husband."[122] Verse 22, perhaps to clarify matters, makes it absolutely clear that these phrases modify the mother's utterance and only indirectly relate to the name given to the child. Further, the modifying phrases are linked directly to a narrative feature (vs. 19ab') which reports in similar language the crucial stimulus in the chain of events leading toward the naming of the child. Hence one can rightly say that the particular name is firmly rooted in a rather tightly constructed unit. The etymology therefore diverges from the pattern of Form I, and shares something of the structural features of a Form II simple report.

---

[121] On the negative force of אי in the name, cf. Driver, Notes (second edition), p. 49. Cf. also Job. 22:30 and M. Pope's comments in his Job (New York: Doubleday, 1965), pp. 152 f. In Phonecian, אי has the force of German keine. Cf. Donner and Röllig, Inschriften, vol. I, text 13:4 and 14:5.

[122] אל probably has been confused with על. Cf. Gen. 20:2; Ps. 2:7.

It is important to note that the particular name does not arise, strictly speaking, from events reported in vss. 19-22, i.e., from birth or the circumstances immediately surrounding it, or the nurses' speech of comfort. Most sharply put, the name and its motivation is in reaction to a prior situation only alluded to in the opening clauses of vs. 19, and obviously referring to the catastrophe reported in vss. 11 f.¶The fact that emphasis is atypically upon a reason for the utterance rather than for the name indicates at once the wider reference. In this sense, what appears to be a report of mixed form, already within itself betrays a function obvious from its wider context. It illustrates, as do vss. 12-18, a reaction to the loss of the ark.[123] One may suggest, therefore, that I Sam. 4:19-21(22) offers a clear case of etymological tradition, using conventional motifs (cf. Gen. 35:16-18), functioning primarily in an altogether different way. Comparable situations, insofar as each make a theological point in relation to received tradition are seen in the simplest Form I reports of Gen. 41:50 ff. and I Sam. 7:12.

---

[123] A striking and consistent difference in the designation of the ark in 4:1-10 and 4:11-22 forces one to see vss. 12-22 as a traditional unit. 4:1-10 has ארון ברית האלהים or ארון (ברית) יהוה (4:3.4.5.6), whereas 4:11-12 has only ארון האלהים. Of course in vs. 19, the use of ונלקח now links vss. 12-18 and 19-22 together.

b. Cases of more advanced mixing

A greater mixing of Form I and II characteristics is evident in several passages of varying ages: Num. 11:1-3; 11:4-34; 13:23 f.; II Sam. 12:25; Gen. 26:17-22. A full Form I occurs in each piece. But firm connections with narrative materials are obvious, and in some cases the strictly narrative force of the formula has been clearly weakened. A sixth passage, Gen. 35:8, shares even more characteristics of Form II simple reports.

1. Num. 11:1-3

The problems of literary analysis of chapter 11 are formidable and largely insoluble.[124] From the point of view of the history of traditions, however, it is reasonably clear that the Taberah tradition (vss. 1-3) once existed quite independently of the themes of manna and flesh on the one hand (chapter 11) and the ark on the other (10:35 ff.).

---

[124] Cf. the commentaries and their disagreements. Most, however, see it as early stuff.

The join, as evidenced by its roughness,[125] was made only at the literary stage. Moreover, Noth has argued[126] that the lament (vs. 2) probably belongs to a later stage of the preliterary history, since the motif belongs generally to the presentation of the wilderness wanderings and needs no special motivation, as it gets here, for its appearance. Thus the earliest visible stage of this special unit involves only vss. 1 and 3, a simple report made up of inseparable narrative statements.

The full Form I with typical relationship between β and γ elements is present in vs. 3. The γ element, although in typical fashion expressing the direct motivation for the name, is not a quoted speech. Rather, it is a causal clause which summarizes in almost identical words, a crucial event reported in the narrative material in vs. 1. Thus the constitutive word play not only appears in β and γ, but also between the name and a key narrated event.

The setting given in vs. 1a cannot function neutrally, therefore. Indeed, the fact of the people's grumbling is necessary to motivate Yahweh's reaction, which in turn provides the direct motivation for the name. Hence the name is linked by assonance to a crucial narrative element. The pattern of Form II in which a reported event serves as a basis for an inference is close at hand. The mixing is probably reflected also in the ambiguity of subject for ויקרא in the β element. It can be indefinite, or can refer to the "people" or to "Yahweh." The very uncertainty already shows a departure from the Form I pattern in which the narrative force, with definite subject, was unambiguous.

---

[125] The text of vs. 1a is very strange, and perhaps reflects the disturbance of a more extensive introduction. Verse 4 with its sudden inversion, a shift to בני ישראל away from the simple עם of vss. 1-3, and the clumsy וישבו ויבכו גם, probably reflects the rough literary joint.

[126] Pentateuch, pp. 135 f.

2. Num. 11:4-34

The name tradition in verse 34 belongs to the story of "cravings" in a way that the itinerary of vs. 35 does not. Yet the attachment to this place קברת התאוה seems shallow rooted at best. The name of the locale appears only in vs. 34, and the word play on the root אוה elsewhere only in vs. 4. This situation suggests that this particular name tradition was grafted on as a kind of framework to earlier material. The roughness of syntax in vs. 4 supports this notion. But more importantly, vss. 33-34 introduce rather abruptly an entirely new theme: Yahweh sends a plague, and its victims--those who had cravings--are buried at a certain place which receives an appropriate name. However, the "craving" motif, expressed in the people's request for meat (vss. 4b.13.18 f.20 f.) finds its satisfaction, or resolution, as Yahweh promises and delivers a stifling quantity of meat (vss. 19-23.31-32). Therefore, vss. 33 f.

lie outside the main thematic lines, and go their own way. It seems likely, therefore, that this name tradition is younger than its surrounding context.[127]

Yet one cannot simply consider vss. 33 f. as literary insertions. The merger with the "craving" story apparently came in the pre-literary stage, for now vs. 33 obviously provides some sort of transition to the name etiology. Thus it is not a question of an independent etiological report here, but rather a secondary layer of tradition which, because of its integration into the older material, is somewhat atypical. However, it assumes a mixed etymological form suggestive of a Form II simple report. In this guise, an event is reported (vs. 33a) along with a full etymological formula of Form I type, and showing assonantal β and γ relationships. However, the *kî* clause, insofar as it refers back to narrative material is not typical of Form I. Even more important, the phrase points to an action (burying) which is only an implied consequence of those events reported in vs. 33. This is precisely the pattern of the *kî* clause where it appears secondarily with a Form II report (Gen. 11:9; 21:31). Moreover, the subject of ויקרא is indefinite. This fact does not necessarily alter the narrative force of the β element. However, the similarities with Form II in the general report structure and in the *kî* explanatory clause lead to a supposition that the impersonally formulated inference of Form II is beginning to emerge with some clarity at this point.

---

[127] *Ibid.*, p. 130.

3. Num. 13:23-24

The problems of literary analysis in Num. 13-14 are many and complex. The tradition resists a thoroughly satisfactory division into literary sources. It seems reasonably clear that the final shape stems from P. In chapter 13, the oldest material is contained in vss. 17b-24. 26-31, but even here minor accretions have grown up in the tradition.[128] In general, the thematic development is toward rebellion, as the ambiguity of the spies' report becomes the cause for dispute.[129] In this context, the Eshkol tradition (vs. 24) is of a subordinate and digressive character. This judgment is confirmed by the striking fact that neither אשכל nor ענבים occur outside vss. 20-24. The continuity in the larger account hinges instead on the phrase פרי הארץ appearing in vs. 20 and 26 f. (cf. Dt. 1:25).

The Eshkol tradition itself (vss. 23 f.) suggests the pattern of Form II simple report, despite its minor role in the wider context, and its almost list-like style of reporting. A setting is provided (vs. 23a) which anticipates the name to be given (cf. elsewhere only with Form II; Gen. 26:23.33; 33:17; Ex. 15:23; II Sam. 5:20). A series of successive events is then reported. The full Form I appears in vs. 24, showing typical βγ elements and word play.[130] The link to a crucial narrative element comes between the name, through the γ element, to vs. 23ab' which reports the cutting of the "cluster" (אשכול). Hence the narrative material is not neutral, but is linked clearly to the etymological formula in a way similar to that of Form II reports. Moreover, the unusual formulation of vs. 24 points rather more to Form II than to Form I. The subject of *qr'* must be indefinite, also, since the singular has no referent.[131]

---

[128] Cf. commentaries; also Noth, Pentateuch, p. 34, n. 121 and p. 15.

[129] This is precisely the focus which Dt. 1:24 f. gives to the tradition.

4. II Sam. 12:24-25

This passage falls into two main parts:

(1) Birth schema:[132] vs. 24

(2) Second name tradition: vs. 25

- (a) Report of message sent
- (b) Naming (Form I)

---

[130] The formulation is atypical. The *waw* conversive ויקרא which sometimes must be translated with a general subject, gives way to an inverted word order, using a *qatal* form of *qr'* למקום ההוא קרא (S reads קראו). The γ element is introduced by על-אדות instead of causative *kî*.

[131] Only S reads קראו . This, of course, may be read as an indefinite construction.

[132] LXX implies ותהר before ותלד . This is the usual phrase. There is no etymological interest expressed in the schema. Such is not necessary to the form.

There are no signs of a literary break between vss. 15b-23 and vs. 24. In the history of traditions they seem to have been related from the beginning because together they reveal the conventional sequence of narrative motifs already seen in I Chron. 7:21b-23 (misfortune and mourning; comforting the mourner; conception and birth; naming). The similarity between the I Chronicles passage, and the account of Solomon's birth, is best explained from the supposition that both passages are built with a conventional sequence of story motifs. (Cf. I Chron. 2:24.) Thus in II Sam. 12, vss. 15b-23 are naturally followed by the birth schema of vs. 24.

But ויהוה אהבו of vs. 24, and the themes in vs. 25, lie both outside the birth schema and the stereotyped motif sequence.[133] Whereas a name etymology often appears as a part of the birth schema, the text here moves in a new direction and reports a second name along with its explanation which is in no direct way related to what has gone before. The inversion ויהוה אהבו, remarkable because no particular emphasis upon the word Yahweh seems meaningful at this point, and because it is the only instance of an inverted subject and predicate in the whole block of tradition in

---

[133] H. P. Smith (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel* [New York: Scribners, 1899], p. 326) and K. Budde (*Die Bücher Samuel* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902], p. 257), among others, understand ויהוה אהבו with vs. 25. Commentators disagree, however. Cf. Hertzberg, *Samuel*, p. 317.

11:2-12:24, indicates a new direction in the text. Moreover, the sudden roughness of syntax in vs. 25,[134] along with a sudden ambiguity in the third person verbal subjects, point toward the subordinate character of vs. 25. Yet this second name tradition cannot now be understood as simply a secondary insertion of once independent material into a literary text, for in itself, it is not fully comprehensible. The antecedents of its pronouns clearly lie in vs. 24 (אהבו and שמו). What is seen here, rather, is elaboration in the style of a brief report on an existing tradition of Solomon's birth and naming.[135] Whether or not the elaboration occurred in the pre-literary history of these traditions is uncertain, and finally irrelevant at this point. What is evident is that a birth schema (vs. 24 to the phrase "and Yahweh loved him") merely provides a general setting for a second name tradition (vs. 25, including "and Yahweh loved him" of vs. 24) to follow.

The assonantal relationship between β and γ elements is clear.[136] Now the name ידידיה must have been understood as "beloved of Yah(weh)," for the expression is known in early poetry (Dt. 33:12 ידיד יהוה) and paralleled in the Ugaritic divine epithet *ydd il ǵzr*.[137] The root and its participial forms are common to Semitic dialects (cf. in Hebrew, Isa. 5:1; Jer. 11:15; Ps. 127:2; 60:7//108:7). It is probable, therefore, that in the name itself an allusion to the narrative element ויהוה אהבו was clear. Already the Syriac and some Latin versions saw this in adding to the element in MT the words which implied Hebrew ידִידו.[138] If such is a correct understanding of the matter, it is evident that the name itself is linked directly to an important narrative feature through the use of synonomous roots (cf. similar case in Gen. 26:20; 26:21). Thus already the pattern of Form I is altered.

---

[134] Cf. the commentaries on וישלח ביד נתן and various emendations. The MT reading is possible, however.

[135] Hertzberg, Samuel, p. 317, speaks of an "express addition."

[136] The γ element is atypical since it is linked to β through בעבור or with some versions בדבר . In any case, causative kî is replaced by b in the sense of "because."

5. Gen. 26:17-22

Three reports are set in series in Gen. 26:17-22. This block introduces new motifs whose limits are set by such a phrase as מִשָּׁם in.vss. 17 and 23. The verses report events in the "Valley of Gerar," in contrast to simply "Gerar" (vs. 6) and "Beersheba" (vs. 23). Surely in the history of traditions they had no original connection with the surrounding context, for they express quite unrelated themes. Even the Beersheba tradition here (vss. 23 ff.), in contrast to the situation in Gen. 21:22 ff., has nothing to do with the theme of strife over water rights as it is expressed in vss. 17-22. Yet the reports of naming of three wells are obviously linked to one another, as vs. 21 (גם and אחרת), and vs. 22 (משם ; אחרת ; כי עתה) indicate.[139] Verse 18 likely stems from the redactor.[140]

---

[137] Text 49:VI:30-31; also 51:VII:46-47; also in Anat pl. X:IV:20 read *šmk mdd i[l]*. Cf. further, M. Noth, *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928), p. 149.

[138] D. Englert (*The Peshitto of Second Samuel* [Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1949], p. 23), speaks of an "ameliorative addition." It is possible, of course, that the original Hebrew contained ידידו or perhaps אהבו . In any case my point of a wider context of meaning is made.

Each of these reports is similar to a Form II report, and yet shows also Form I features. Each provides a setting, but only vs. 19 could be considered neutral (vss. 19-20.21aa'; 22aa'). Each reports a direct motivation for the name, whether in a kî clause (vss. 20.22) or a preceding reported event (vs. 21). The usual pattern of relationship between β and γ, or the latter's substitute, is evident. However, γ refers to narrated material. The name in each case is linked unmistakably to a crucial narrative feature by use of a synonym (vss. 20.21)[141] or commensurate descriptive response (vs. 22; cf. Gen. 26:32-33a). There is little doubt that in each case, the narrative features function as a unit to explain the name, and in a way closely resembling that of Form II.

---

[139] Whether or not the reports are each a remnant of a larger saga is not certainly known, and no longer pertinent. The question for present purposes has to do with their characteristics as they stand. For a reconstruction of a saga type, of which the reports are but residue, cf. Westermann, Forschung, p. 67.

[140] Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 302 f.; Holzinger, Genesis, p. 175; Fichtner, op. cit., p. 381, note 5. But others (Driver, Genesis, pp. 252 f.; Speiser, Genesis, pp. 203 f. et al.) are not sure. Verses 19-22, however, tell of the naming as if it were for the first time. This tends to confirm the secondary character of vs. 18, probably linked to vs. 15 somehow.

It is worth noting that first signs of further narrative complexity already appear in this passage. The three reports, though formally somewhat independent of each other, make up a series which has a certain dramatic development issuing finally in the possession of water and living space. This in itself points toward the Form II usage.

6. Gen. 35:8

This verse is clearly independent of its context. The appearance of tradition about Deborah, who is unnamed in 24:59, is very abrupt and completely unmotivated by the preceding verses. Like so many grave traditions (e.g. Num. 20:1; Dt. 10:6), the note on Deborah's death and burial was probably occasioned by the mention of a particular locale.[142]

---

[141] In vs. 20, Hithp. *ʿśq* is apparently parallel to *rîb*. The word is known from its cognates in the various Semitic languages. It occurs in eighth century Aramaic in the context of *rîb* (cf. Donner-Röllig, *Inschriften*, vol. I, text #224:20 and #226:8). *Śiṭnāh* in vs. 21 occurs elsewhere only in Ezra 4:6 and refers to a written document, perhaps an "accusation." This is certainly in the context of strife (cf. 4:1). Moreover, the verb *śṭm* is associated in Ps. 109:4.20 with a semantic unit similar to that often connected with *rîb* (Ex. 17:2; Num. 20:3; Jgs. 11:25; Neh. 13:25 *et al.*). Thus at the very least, the verb *ʿśq* and the word *śiṭnāh* are naturally, if not synonomously, associated with *rîb*.

Formally, the verse is a compressed piece which shares many features of Form II reports. Verse 8a simply reports the death of Deborah. As in Form II, a locale for burial is specifically identified. The naming follows, formulated with an indefinite subject. There is no *kî* explanatory clause. Undoubtedly the name is intended to be a commensurate descriptive response to a customary action, though unexpressed, of mourning for the dead. Thus the narrative material in vs. 8a provides the situation in which the particular name may arise, and also implies conventional actions which presumably motivated the name. There is little question, therefore, that the narrative elements function together to provide a basis for the name.

c. Cases of advanced mixing in developed reports

Two occurrences of the mixed etymological form, both in the older strata of literary tradition, appear in narrative material similar to a Form II developed report (Num. 21:1-3; Gen. 25:21-26). Each passage shows a thematic development whose climax (or immediate circumstances surrounding such) motivates the particular name reported by the ויקרא formula without a γ element. Moreover, in each case, the subject of ויקרא is indefinite as is usual in Form II, and the inferential force typical for Form II coexists with the narrative function of waw conversive ויקרא .

---

[142] Cf. Noth, *Pentateuch*, p. 93, and von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 333. Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 379, correctly saw that vs. 8 belonged to the latest stage of the complex vss. 1-8.

1. Num. 21:1-3

These verses form a finished unit originally independent of its present literary context and representative of older material in Numbers.[143] It clearly breaks the continuity between 20:22-29 and 21:4 (note "Mount Hor" in 20:22 and 21:4, but not 21:1-3).[144] The sequence of motifs, moreover, (vow made; vow fulfilled separately by each contracting party) because of its conventional rigidity (cf. Jgs. 11:29-40; I Sam. 1:11-28; Num. 30:3.4 ff.; Eccles. 5:3.4), suggests that the tradition originated on the oral level in essentially the form in which it now stands. As such, these three verses comprise a report structurally similar to the Form II simple report. Events reported in vss. 1-2 lead to the direct motivation for the name, which is narrated in vs. 3b; the relation between this event and the name giving is seen in the assonance between ויחרם and the name חרמה . There is no γ element and the indefinite subject of ויקרא tends toward an inferential על-כן קרא .

What is striking here is the fact that the report shows a dramatic development typical in the Form II developed report. The setting voices a tension created by the warring Canaanite king (vs. 1), which is resolved when Israel "utterly destroyed them and their cities" (vs. 3). And the means toward that resolution is encompassed by the report of the vow and its fulfillment. Thus the case is not simply that the report consists of three tightly knit narrative elements, but rather that a thematic movement from tension to resolution shapes the piece. More important, perhaps, is the fact that the resolution itself, the final resting point of the report, directly motivates the name to be given. Put another way, the weight of the tradition, its function, i.e., to describe the destruction of the Canaanites, at the same time provides the motivation for and sense to the name of the region.[145] Furthermore the key means to the resolution, the vow, is integrally bound up with the verb ḥrm which is to suggest directly by assonance the name to be given. There can be little doubt, then, that these narrative elements function as do the Form II dramatic units, to motivate and explain the name.

---

[143] Noth, Pentateuch, p. 34.

[144] Cf. the commentators. Overwhelmingly they assign vss. 1-3 to the J source. Noth, Pentateuch, p. 34, is not as positive.

2. Gen. 25:21-26

In their present form, these verses comprise a loosely woven fabric set in the context of other fragmentary traditions about Esau and Jacob (vss. 27-34).[146] Despite the difficulty in the text of Rebekah's cry (vs. 22b),[147] it is reasonably certain that vss. 22 f. belong together. Yet the prophecy in vs. 23 floats somewhat independently of the context provided by vss. 24 ff. and vs. 21. Thematically, it is oriented toward tribal tradition (לאמים // גוים cf. Gen. 27:29; Isa. 34:1; Ps. 105:44; Gen. 9:25 ff.), whereas the birth narrative (vss. 24 ff.) is formulated fundamentally to report the birth and naming of specific persons.[148] Moreover, plural הבנים in vs. 22 presupposes a situation which is only first reported in vs. 24 by means of a typical circumstantial clause (cf. Gen. 38:27; Gen. 24:30). It is likely, therefore, that vss. 22 f. were originally independent and were joined, probably at the literary stage in the history of tradition, to the report of the birth of Esau and Jacob.[149] If so, vss. 21.24-26ba' may be examined as a literarily separate unit. Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that these verses originated in oral tradition in nearly their present form, for the narrative motifs of barren wife and birth-naming frequently appear joined together in a dramatic sequence. (Cf. the skeletal outline of Jgs. 13:2.24 and I Sam. 1:2.20; a more formulaic witness in Gen. 29:31 f. and 30:22 f.; implicit sequence in Gen. 21:1 ff.; 20:17 f.)

---

[145] From its context here, מקום probably has a wider connotation (although the name, Hormah, in Jgs. 1:17 refers to a city). Cf. Ex. 23:20 and I Sam. 12:8, and G. Gray, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers (New York: Scribners, 1903), p. 273.

---

[146] These verses are now framed by priestly tradition in vss. 19-20 and 26 bb' ("and Isaac was 60 years old when she bore them"). Verses 21-26ba' then are J. Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 293 ff.; Speiser, Genesis, pp. 193 ff., and commentaries in general.

[147] Most translators follow the Syriac, which may itself reflect nothing more than a correction of a corrupt MT, adding חיה : "if it is like this, why do I live?" (Cf. Gen. 27:46.)

[148] The narrator and audience undoubtedly were aware that tribal ancestors were being talked about. But this supposition should not blur the actual characteristics of a birth report, so that one sees only poorly disguised tribal history. An analogous situation is in Gen. 29:31-30:24, where tribal ancestors are spoken of in quite specific, personal terms. Cf. von Rad's comments in his Genesis, pp. 291 f.

Now the piece vss. 21.24-26ba', a considerably elaborated birth schema B., reveals some characteristics of a Form II simple report. The etymological formula appears in vss. 25b and 26ba'; in each case the subject is indefinite. There is no γ element. The direct motivation as shown by the assonantal word play is narrated prior to the formula. One feels, therefore, something of the inferential force of the formulation. There is also evident a dramatic development. The setting which was neutral in the Form I simplest reports now gives expression to a point of tension which is only resolved, through plea and responsive divine action, in the event of birth. The thematic movement from tension to resolution, paralleled in Form II developed reports, constitutes the whole of the report. But at the same time, this resolution and the circumstances surrounding it, provide the motivation and therefore etymological sense for the particular names given to the newly born sons. Furthermore, vs. 24, a narrative element which, strictly speaking, lies somewhat outside the barest possible line from tension to resolution, provides detail crucial to the understanding of the birth situation. Thus the whole report--even with its rather detailed description of the birth event--is a tightly constructed unit which leads to the motivation and therefore explanation of the names.

---

[149] Westermann, Forschung, pp. 78 f., on slightly different grounds, reaches the same conclusion.

d. Cases of advanced mixing in narrative

There are two occurrences of a mixed form in the midst of material similar in structure to the Form II narrative. Each appears in the J document and deals with personal names (Gen. 19:37 f.; Gen. 2:23). They each show the same ambiguity of form and function as other mixed passages. Here, however, these complex narratives consisting of two well marked dramatic scenes, do not function primarily to explain a name. At best the etymological interest helped to shape the narrative lines.

1. Gen. 19:30-38

There is general agreement that Gen. 19:30-38 is a literary unit, probably from J, and certainly originally was independent of its present context.[150] Its present connection with Zoar (vs. 30a; cf. vs. 22) is likely secondary in the history of the tradition, as the somewhat repetitive and full setting in vs. 30 shows.[151] But the artistic balance of the piece suggests that it became fixed in tradition early, and one cannot with much certainty push further.

---

[150] Cf. the major commentaries.

Yet for the question of etymological function, there are difficulties. Verse 37 contains no γ element, and vs. 38 seems to have lost a name but retained its explanation (בן-עמי). The basis for this judgment lies only in the divergent Greek readings. Form I appears in vss. 37 and 38. All Greek manuscripts in vs. 37 following Hebrew מאבי add λεγουσα εκ του πατρος μου ;[152] and vs. 38 reads in the Greek: και εκαλεσεν το ονομα αυτου Αμμαν υιος του γενους μου.[153] Commentators have been at odds whether or not to accept the LXX reading as superior.[154] Since for vss. 30-36 the Greek implies, with very minor divergencies, the present MT, it seems likely that such a γ clause and the name, Ammon, were at one time in the Hebrew version. In such a case, both vss. 37 and 38 contain a typical example of Form I with β and γ elements. The latter, as shown by the first person possessive pronoun (πατρος μου and γενους μου) are quoted speeches which directly motivate the particular names. The familiar assonantal relationships between β and γ are obvious.

---

[151] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 217, who sees a literary insert in vs. 30a.

[152] Implying Hebrew לאמר מאבי . One fragmentary cursive MSS omits λεγουσα .

[153] There are a few minor variants in the spelling of Amman. A few MSS add λεγουσα after Amman.

[154] Contrast for example Gunkel, Genesis, p. 220, and Procksch, Genesis, p. 133.

Yet the piece shares features of Form II, notably a structural unity:

(1) Tension: vs. 31
(2) Towards resolution:
    vss. 32-33
    vss. 34-35
(3) Conception: vs. 36
(4) Resolution of the tension (birth):
    vs. 37 (Form I)
    vs. 38 (Form I)

There are no neutral narrative elements, for the etymological formulae clearly are integrally bound up with them. The tension created, as vs. 31 gives it, by childless daughters in a nearly male-less world, is resolved only in the birth of sons in vss. 37 f. And naming, more often than not, was immediately associated with the event of birth. Moreover, the γ elements effectively capsulate the means toward this resolution: "from my father" (note the role which "father" plays in the narrative: vss. $31.32^2.33^2.34^2.35.36$) or "son of my kinsman." In short, the γ speeches are commensurate descriptive responses to the bulk of the narrative complex (vss. 32-35). As responses, they employ synonym (עם)[155] and nearly identical phraseology (מאבינו vss. 32.34). Already much of the Form II pattern is evident.

Obviously, one must speak here of a narrative. The characteristics found typical for developed reports are visible but considerably broadened. Conversation appears (31-32.34), scenes are played out (vss. 31-33.34-35), and narrative third person "reports" are integrated into the whole (vss. 33.35.36 ff.). Moreover, the analysis has demonstrated that the etymological etiological formulae are organically related to the entire piece.

Yet one cannot overlook the fact that the etymologies are not the final item in the unit. The laconic concluding formula ("He is the father of . . . to this day.") appearing both in vs. 37 and vs. 38, prohibit understanding the function of the whole solely in terms of etymology. These phrases, since they clearly modify the persons named, establish a continuity between the tribes of the present (Moabites and Ammonites) and the sons of Lot. There is little indication, especially in light of the balanced structure of the piece, that the "extension" formulae are secondary in the tradition. It seems, rather, more likely that interests which often are expressed independently of one another (e.g. origin of tribes or tribal characteristics [Gen. 9:18b; 4:20 f.] and name etymologies), already at the earliest visible stage have been fused together. Thus at best, one can say that the etymological interests helped shape the narrative; the clear relational lines between narrative elements and the name formula indicate as much. But the etymology is subordinate to the wider interest expressed sharply by the "extension formulae." The whole piece drives toward tribal origins rather than name explanations.

---

[155] Hebrew עם (vs. 38) is not to be translated "people" but rather as a male relative, a "paternal kinsman." Speiser, Gemesis, p. 144, renders "son of my kin." Greek γένος translates עם in this more specific sense here and in Gen. 25:17; 35:29, the conventional death announcement: "he was gathered to his kinsmen."

2. Gen. 2:18-24 (J)

This piece is a thematic unit separable on the one hand from vss. 15-17 and on the other hand from vs. 25 which introduces a new traditional motif.[156] There are certain signs of sifting within this unit. The LXX reads only θεος in vss. 19.21 for Hebrew יהוה אלהים.[157] Verse 19b is grammatically disturbed and almost a doublet of vs. 20. A broader subject, involving new vocabulary, is suddenly introduced in vs. 24. However, the evidence does not decisively argue against seeing an essentially unified whole.[158] Perhaps the roughness in composition derives from a now obscure pre-literary history.

---

[156] Cf. Gunkel, Genesis, pp. 11 ff. and von Rad, Genesis, pp. 82 ff., and others.

[157] W. Eichrodt, Die Quellen der Genesis von neuem Untersucht (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930), pp. 199 ff. summarizes the problem and its solutions in the wider context of the whole chapter.

The piece is carefully built:

(1) Tension: vs. 18
(2) Towards resolution: vss. 19-20
    Creation of animals
    Bringing them to the man
    Naming
(3) Resolution: vss. 21-23
    Creation of woman
    Bringing her to the man
    Name stipulated
(4) Derivation of sexual attraction: vs. 24

One sees immediately that the material goes beyond a developed report in complexity because of the two clearly demarcated scenes (vss. 19-20; 21-23) united in the movement from tension to resolution.

Now the name tradition in vs. 23 offers a modification of the typical Form I. The act of naming is not narrated, but stipulated in a curiously rhythmic speech using the Niphal of *qr'*. However, generally speaking, the stipulation functions similarly to the usual β element. A *kî* causal clause follows and expressly presents the direct motivation for the name.

---

[158] Cf. to the contrary, C. A. Simpson, *Traditions*, pp. 53 ff.

But with respect to this etymological formula, the narrative material does not function neutrally. Not only is the naming of woman expected in the structural scheme of the whole piece (all the animals receive their names from the man), but the *kî* clause in the formula as speech is commensurate descriptive response to a crucial event reported, i.e., the creation of woman. Thus the name itself is organically related to the bulk of the preceding narrative. Again the patterns of Form II are near at hand.

Verse 24, however, is not to be taken lightly. By drawing an inference from the resolution of the narrative, i.e., the creation of woman from man, the whole piece is given a larger function than simply explaining a name. There are no strong reasons for doubting the verse's originality here. So again, as with Gen. 19:30-38, one is confronted by a narrative which was probably shaped in part by an etymological interest, but which functions in an altogether different way. The story drives toward an explanation of sexual attraction rather than name.

e. Cases of very advanced mixing

There are five occurrences of etymological formulae in which the distinctions between Forms I and II have almost disappeared. A grammatical formulation characteristic of Form I (ויקרא) now functions entirely as על-כן קרא of Form II in Jos. 5:9 and II Sam. 6:8. The opposite is the case in Gen. 29:34.35; 30: 5 f.

The latter is clear because to all appearances the material here conforms to the pattern of a Form I simplest report. In Gen. 29:34.35 the birth schema provides a neutral setting in which the mother's utterance may motivate the child's particular name. Then follows the report of the naming.[159] In terms of function these two verses are paralleled exactly by Gen. 29:33, a Form I report. Yet vss. 34.35 read על-כן קראה instead of the usual ותקרא .[160] It is clear, therefore, that the inferential function of על-כן , so characteristic of Form II, has given way almost completely to the narrative force of a finite verb with a definite subject in a specific time.

In the case of Gen. 30: 5 f. there is no narrative material intrinsic to the etymology of vs. 6. In fact the name tradition (Dan, vs. 6b) and its motivation (vs. 6aa') only loosely fit the preceding dialogue. The Dan tradition rests in a certain tension with vs. 6ab', which appears to be a conventional explanation for a name (cf. Gen. 29:33 and 30:22) but lacks the paronomasia with the name Dan. It is likely, therefore, that the Dan tradition, now a fragmentary birth schema C., once was independent of its present context.

---

[159] Cf. above, p. 49ff.

[160] In verse 34, קרא should be read with S and most versions קראה . One MSS of the Targum even has ותקרא .

As such, it conforms to the pattern of the simplest Form I report: a name and its speech-motivation is reported. Here again, the etymological formula, while suggestive of Form II (על-כן קראה שמו), functions primarily as narration, and thus parallels the Form I usage of ותקרא .

An opposite sort of mixing is apparent in Jos. 5:9. The fact that an interpretation of the quoted speech in this verse is so difficult, already indicates the imprecision of any connection with the preceding narrative materials. The new theme is only very loosely related to the subject of circumcision (5:2-8),[161] and was likely independent of its present context. The verse may of course be a remnant of another narrative tradition, perhaps connected with 5:1, or it may reflect a later accretion to the circumcision account. In any case, the etymological formula in vs. 9, while cast like Form I (ויקרא שם), functions inferentially as does Form II. The adverbial modifier, "as at this day," demands an indefinite subject for ויקרא , and makes clear that the name clause is drawing an inference applicable into the narrator's time. Hence the strictly narrative function of the verb in Form I has broken down.

Similarly, with II Sam. 6:8. This verse apparently is not a literary insertion into the history of the ark.[162] But there are grounds for suspecting it to be younger than the surrounding materials. For one thing, David's reaction to the same event, i.e., the death of Uzzah, is given twice: once in vs. 8 (anger), and a second time in vs. 9 (fear). Now vs. 8 appears to have arisen later than the tradition of Uzzah and the ark because it disturbs a conventional sequence of motifs (Yahweh's anger, his punishment; a fearful reaction accompanied by repentance, pleas, laments or the like. Cf. Num. 12:9 ff.; 11:1-3; Jgs. 10:7 ff.; II Kings 13:3 ff.; Ps. 106:40 ff.; Jos. 7:1 ff. 6 ff.).[163] The name tradition is at best a subordinate motif secondary to the original ark story.[164]

---

[161] Childs, JBL 82 (1963), p. 285. Noth, Studien, p. 39, speaks of an "etiological remark."

As secondary, or perhaps only subordinate tradition, the verse shows the ויקרא formulation functioning as על-כן קרא. The verb is modified by "until this day" and hence must be translated with an indefinite subject and understood as a conclusive clause. Again, the Form I features have nearly given way to a Form II inferential function. This conclusion is indicated already by the absence of a neutral setting typical of the Form I pattern.

---

[162] Cf. the commentaries, and especially Rost, Thronnachfolge, p. 129, who takes chapter 6 to be largely a literary unity.

[163] I Chron. 13:9 reads גרן כידן for II Sam. 6:6 גרן נכון. This fact has been used to support the hypothesis of a version which played upon a verb kîd.

[164] The direct motivation, though clear because of the word play, is atypical. It is formulated as a subordinate clause rather than as a quoted speech or reported event in coordinate style. This fact may in itself indicate that the verse is not integrally linked to its wider narrative surroundings.

PART D. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study of etymological formulae and their associated narrative contexts has yielded a fundamental distinction between Fichtner's Form I and II. The former is in no constitutive way linked with narrative material, and the latter shows a basic narrative structure organically related to the name formula as is premise to conclusion. A large body of material shares in varying degrees characteristics of both Form I and II.

In no case is the etymological interest a focal point for extensive traditions. In their most complex occurrences (Gen. 19:37 f.; Gen. 2:23), the Mixed Forms are subordinated to a narrative interest other than etymology. The two cases of genuine Form II narrative (Gen. 11:1-9; 26:23-33) are anecdotal in length. Most of the time, etymological etiology is expressed by formulae (Form I), or short reports (Form II or Mixed Form) in secondary or at least subordinate layers of tradition. Thus great caution is demanded in speaking of etymological etiological narrative. An example of such is quite rare.

APPENDIX TO SECTION I

There are several occurrences of etymological formulae where the isolating of surrounding narrative material from its wider context cannot decisively be carried through on the basis of literary and tradition-history criticism. In such cases, the application of criteria developed thus far in this above investigation brings a measure of clarity to the problematic analysis. Such application, of course, can in no way demonstrate the validity of these criteria. The procedure merely shows something of their utility in shifting the balance of probabilities in those cases where an investigator lacks reasonably certain grounds for deciding what narrative elements in a given complex originally functioned integrally with the etymology.

The problematic passages have to do with the names of persons (Ex. 2:10; 2:22; I Sam. 1:20), places (Gen. 28:19; Jgs. 2:5; 15:17) and objects (Jgs. 6:24). When subjected to analysis, most of them reduce to the pattern of a Mixed Form report, which assumes a subordinate role in its wider narrative context.

1. Ex. 2:10

The story of Moses' adoption (vss. 1-10) has frequently been analyzed in terms of J and E by commentators. Very recently the attempt has been made again.[165] A more reasonable view in my opinion, since positive signs of J or E are absent, is to assume that old material (likely J?) has undergone various expansions. In this case, the several inconsistencies (e.g., the introduction of an older sister in vss. 4 f.7, whereas vss. 1 f. imply that Moses is the first born) are best explained, especially since they do not form a connected narrative in themselves.[166] The resulting picture is that vss. 1-3.5-6.(9?).10ab'-10b represent the oldest visible layer of the tradition (vss. 4 and 7 f.10aa' through הילד are expansions). It is no accident, then, that very old traditional motifs which are deeply rooted in ancient near eastern culture, appear in just these few verses.[167]

---

[165] Cf. G. Fohrer, Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 18 ff. Less recently, Beer, Exodus, pp. 19 f. The earlier commentators saw mostly E with J influence or vice versa.

Form I appears in vs. 10b and shows a typical assonantal word play. The question is whether or not this name etymology is organically connected with the older layer. There are no signs of a literary break. B. S. Childs has argued, with good reason, that the traditional background of the motifs used in the account makes it highly unlikely that the narrative focused on an explanation of Moses' name.[168]

---

[166] Noth, Pentateuch, p. 31; Exodus, p. 25. Cf. also B. S. Childs, "The Birth of Moses," JBL 84 (1965), pp. 109 ff.

[167] Cf. earlier H. Gressmann, Mose und seine Zeit (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913), pp. 1 ff., and the recent corrections by Childs, op. cit. The traditional adoption procedure makes it probable that the wet nurse motif (vs. 9) belongs with the oldest stratum of tradition.

[168] Childs, op. cit., p. 116.

However, the etymology offered fits in a general way some of the action in the story. Thus Noth is undecided.[169] In terms of the thematic development of these verses, the tension created when the babe is abandoned is only finally resolved at the point of adoption (vs. 10ab'). Now naming seems naturally enough to be concomitant with the legal act of adoption. Yet to my knowledge, there is little evidence that naming and adoption were joined in tradition in the way that birth and naming were linked.[170] Therefore the possibility is at least open that the naming of Moses is secondary to an original adoption tradition. In any case, the former is subordinate to the thematic lines from tension to resolution.

Now the name tradition in vs. 10b certainly conforms to the pattern of the Form I simplest report. A neutral setting is provided (10a); direct motivation for the name is expressed in a classic γ element. Yet, something of the Form II *simple* report structure is also visible here, for the name is related through its motivation to a narrative feature which describes the rescue scene (vss. 5 f.). But this relation is at best very loose, and really ill fitted. The quoted γ element speech has Pharoah's daughter "drawing" the babe from the water, whereas vss. 5 f. only imply such an act. Neither מים nor משה appear here. And only by a further logical extension could one say that the princess herself fetched the child. The γ element, then, is loosely descriptive of an implicit action in the narrative material. There is neither paronomasia nor synonym expressed. It seems doubtful, therefore, that the formula as it appears here functions as an integral part of the whole tradition. Therefore the etymology is best understood as a part of a Form I simplest report, subordinate to the main narrative, and perhaps modeled in part on the pattern of Form II reports.

---

[169] *Exodus*, p. 26.

[170] The only possible Old Testament text which might possibly show their connection, other than Ex. 2:10, is Ruth 4:16, and this is very doubtful. Extra-biblical evidence likewise is very meagre.

2. Ex. 2:22

This verse is judged by most commentators to be a part of the literary block vss. 11-14(15); 16-22 (J).[171] Noth[172] has argued that the "Gershom" tradition is a bit of northern material (Gershom is the traditional ancestor of the Danite priests, cf. Jgs. 18:30) which was linked up with the figure of Moses in the later development of the Pentateuch. Now vs. 22 is a typical example of the birth schema simplest Form I report.[173] The motivation for the name, however, shows only a highly generalized link with the preceding material. Neither גר nor גור appear outside the γ element. Hence there is no assonance between name and narrative. The element does not express an obvious synonym to a specific word in vss. 16-21. Moreover, the name is not given as a descriptive response commensurate with a specific narrative element. Rather the speech-motivation is a comment on the general situation on Moses in Midian. It is a proposition illustrated in the account, rather than being one derived from the story's development. Therefore, originally the "Midian" tradition seems to have functioned separate from the etymology,[174] and thus the latter has retained its essentially pure Form I characteristics.

---

[171] Cf. the major commentaries.

[172] Exodus, p. 37; also his Pentateuch, pp. 202 f.

[173] Some MSS read for MT ויקרא the more usual ותקרא . The LXX adds further elements of the birth schema.

3. I Sam. 1:20

This verse comes in the midst of a much larger tradition complex extending over 1:1-4:1a whose point is expressed in 3:19-21.[175] Most critics agree that the redactor's hand is visible in 2:35 f. and in the insertion of 2:1-10. Chapter 1 falls into four distinct parts: (a) the setting (vss. 1-8); (b) the vow (vss. 9-18); (c) God keeps bargain (vss. 19 f.); (d) Hannah keeps bargain (vss. 21-28).

---

[174] The unmotivated choice of Midian as the locale for Moses' flight shows that the account was likely connected with the theophany tradition in chapter 3 rather than to an explanation of a name.

[175] Noth, Studien, pp. 60 f. Cf. also Hertzberg, Samuel, pp. 43 f.

There is little question that this material passed into the Dtr history already unified.[176] The strongest support for this judgment comes from a study of the vow motif. As vss. 11 ff. show, a report (ותדר נדר) introduces a quotation consisting of a protasis (אם plus emphatic infinitive plus finite verb) and apodosis (first person finite verb plus simple waw). This quoted speech governs the shape of the narration to follow, for each party implicated in the vow (God and Hannah) fulfills their obligation. Yahweh "remembers" Hannah and she bears a son (vss. 19 f.), and Hannah "gives" the boy to Yahweh (vss. 21-28). The movement from vow to complete satisfaction constitutes the story. Precisely the same pattern appears in Num. 21:1-3 and Jgs. 11:30-39. (Cf. also Gen. 28:20-22 and the fulfillment in 35:1-7; also Num. 30:3 f. and Eccles. 5:3 f.; further in Ugaritic, Krt 200 ff.) In light of the conventional motif sequence, I Sam. 1:11-28 appears to have been a unified whole in its earlier history. This means further that the birth schema and etymological Form I in vs. 20 must be seen as a subordinate motif within the vow schema. It lies outside the thematic lines which reach their completion in vs. 28.

From the point of view of the criteria for etiological report, a similar conclusion is indicated. At the very least, vs. 20 conforms to the pattern of a simplest Form I report on the occasion of birth.[177] The name is related through its motivation only loosely to a crucial narrative element. The verb שאל is in a very general way descriptive of the action described in vss. 9-11. Yet the latter section obviously is an important element in the thematic structure of the whole. On the other hand, the strongest link between name and narrative material appears in Eli's dismissal speech (vs. 17) in which Hannah's action is explicitly described as "making a petition" (שלתך אשר שאלת)[178] thus making a word play on שמואל as does the quoted speech-motivation (vs. 20b). But Eli's blessing (cf. 2:20) is a minor motif in the overall structure and even within vss. 9-20. What is missing here is a tight structure whose elements in their logical interrelationships drive inexorably toward the particular name. The fact that the final resolution of vss. 1-28 does not actually motivate the name giving (even though vss. 27 f. may contain word plays on Samuel's name and may relate to the vow itself)[179] reveals immediately that vs. 20 did not provide the focus for the surrounding complex. At best, the etymology appears here in a Form I simplest report, and perhaps helped vss. 12-18 gain its present form by providing the suggestion for Eli's speech.

---

[176] Even such a radical critic as Gressmann found only a few secondary accretions. Cf. his Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung und prophetie Israels (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1910), pp. 1 f.

---

[177] The opening phrase of vs. 20 is troublesome. The singular (with some MSS) is probably correct. Some critics place it just before vs. 21. (So Ehrlich, Randglossen, III, p. 166; J. Wellhausen, Der Text der bücher Samuelis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1871), pp. 37 f., and followed by many.) The LXX places the phrase before Hebrew ותלד , but this breaks the conventional Hebrew formula.

[178] Many MSS read שְׁאֵלָתֵךְ . Cf. GK^{2} 23 f.

4. Gen. 28:19

This verse falls clearly in the midst of a complex block of tradition given in vss. 10-22. Because of numerous doublets, there is substantial agreement that a J version partially preserved in vss. (10).13.15.16.19 is now overlaid and dominated by an E account (vss. 11-12.17-18.20-22).[180] Both versions speak of a dream theophany: E explicitly (vs. 12) and J implicitly (vs. 16). But only the J fragment contains an example of an etymological formula.[181] Verse 19b is probably a gloss.[182]

---

[179] On the speculation that at one time the story was linked to Saul (cf. שָׁאוּל in vs. 28), cf. I. Hylander, Der Literarische Samuel-Saul Komplex (Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1932), pp. 13 ff. In my opinion, the state of the text offers little firm support for such an hypothesis.

[180] Cf. Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 30 f.38 f.; Simpson, Traditions, p. 97; Speiser, Genesis, pp. 217 f. Cf. recently, E. L. Ehrlich, Der Traum im alten Testament (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1953), pp. 27-32. Also, C. Keller, "Über einige alttestamentliche Heiligtumslegenden," ZAW 67 (1955), pp. 141-168; 68 (1956), pp. 85-97.

[181] That the interest of E lay elsewhere is shown by the absence of a clear naming formula and by the E reflections (Gen. 31:13; 35:1-7) which effectively reduce the tradition to its cultic significance in conjunction with Jacob's vow and its fulfillment. Even in 28:1 ff., the vow tradition exists in some tension with the story elements preceding. (E.g., vs. 17 has the place referred to as the house of God, whereas in vs. 22, the pillar is given this designation.)

Now the etymology, appearing in vs. 19a, seems to be directly motivated by Jacob's speech reported in vs. 16b. The name given to the place represents a commensurate descriptive response to the substance of a speech. There is no ע element. Thus the occurrence of the name giving here, while similar to Form I, is close to the pattern of Form II simple report. Further conclusions may be drawn only with difficulty. It does not appear, however, that a direct link remains between name and crucial narrative elements outside the simplest report schema. The chief difficulty is that the J tradition is fragmentary, and dominated now by the promise motif which certainly is not directly related to the name or its explanation. Yet the name given is commensurate with the action reported in vs. 13a (theophany) and the name's motivation comes in a speech which is a stylized reaction to the theophany (cf. Jgs. 6:22; 13:22; Gen. 16:13b; Ex. 20:18 f.; Dt. 5:24 ff.). Insofar as these elements are linked together, something of the Form II simple report structure remains. Thus, vs. 19a appears to be a Mixed Form. The more complex relationships visible in developed etymological reports are obscured if they once were present.

---

[182] Ehrlich, Traum, p. 27. Noth, Pentateuch, pp. 30 f. Cf. Gen. 35:6; Jgs. 1:23; Jos. 18:13; Gen. 48:3.

5. Jgs. 2:1-5

Despite the disagreements over the literary relationships between Joshua and Jgs. 1:1-2:5 and Jgs. 2:6 ff., it is clear enough that Jgs. 2:1-5 is a literary unit.[183] It is obviously to be separated from chapter 1 on account of style, and from 2:6 ff. because of sharply differing subject matter. Within the piece, there are no signs of literary seams. Since ample evidence is lacking to decide surely whether or not vss. 1.5a preserve old sanctuary tradition,[184] the option of seeing a Form I simplest report here is not a clear choice. Furthermore, it is difficult to view these five verses as a tightly constructed tradition unit, for the name etymology is subordinate, almost digressive, to the thrust of the weightiest part of the piece, namely the programmatic message delivered by the angel of Yahweh.

This passage displays some typical festures of a Form II simple report. Verse 5a, which appears like the β element of Form I, is motivated directly by the event reported in vs. 4b (note assonance). There is no γ element. The setting given in vs. 1 specifies a locale and anticipates the name. The narrative material is not neutral. Not only is vs. 1 related to the name, but vs. 4a is formulated to express connections between the angel's speech and vs. 4 f. Yet the whole is not a simple Form II report, for the naming and its etymology does not come at the close of the material and the inferential function of vs. 5a is not clear. Verse 5b contains a narrative element, likely original, which is not directly related to the name tradition. Moreover, the relation between the name through its motivation to the main material of the piece is weak. "Weeping" is a quite general reaction only loosely suggested by the actual reported content of the message. One might contrast the tightly knit logical relationships in Gen. 32:2 f.; Num. 11:1 ff.; Gen. 38:27-30, for example.

---

[183] Cf. the commentaries.

[184] Nowack, Richter, p. 13, suggests this possibility.

All these considerations lead to the conclusion that at best, the etymological formula here expresses a subordinate motif in a larger whole, and that it assumes a mixed form close to that of a Form II simple etiological report.

6. Jgs. 15:17

This verse is part of a more or less homogeneous literary block in chapters 14 and 15. There is no sign that vs. 17 is a literary gloss.[185] Yet in the history of traditions, Gressmann has argued that the name tradition in vs. 17 was of independent origin.[186] The new beginning in vs. 17a tends to support this judgment, since such expressions in Judges generally introduce a new traditional piece.[187] Moreover, vs. 17 lies somewhat outside the chapter's thematic development which clearly reaches its climax and resolution in vs. 15.[188] The attachment of the tradition in vss. 18-19 is surely secondary to the growth of these materials in their pre-literary stages. They have nothing except Samson and the locale in common with 15:1-16:17.

---

[185] Cf. Moore, Judges, p. 345; Budde, Richter, p. 104; Gressmann, Anfänge, pp. 240 ff. et al.

[186] Gressmann, Anfänge, pp. 25 f.

In terms of criteria for etymological etiological report, it is clear that vs. 17 itself is closest to a Form II simple report, even though its formulation is like that of Form I. Lacking a γ element, and being linked to the preceding verse, it reports an event which provides the direct motivation (17ab') for the particular name reported in vs. 17b. The name, as elsewhere, expresses a synonym to a verb used in the reported motivation.[189] Yet this name tradition is only loosely linked to specific narrative elements outside of vs. 17. The name of the place is already assumed in vss. 9 and 14; the noun "jawbone" appears in vs. 15.

---

[187] Richter, Untersuchungen, p. 358. Cf. 6:25; 7:9; 9:42. Cf. also the Dtr inserts in 6:7 and 8:33.

[188] The speech in vs. 16 is probably of independent origin. Cf. Gressmann, Anfänge, p. 254. Also, Simpson, Composition, p. 60.

[189] Tradition probably understood רמת לחי from the verb רמה "to throw away." Even if originally this were not the sort of word play intended, the etymology is still within the realm of the typical because of the occurrence of לחי in the name and its particular motivation.

There is nothing of the tight relationship characteristic of the Form II simple report in which the narrative elements drive toward the etymology. The name is not connected by assonance, or synonym, or commensurate descriptive response. At best it picks up a detail unimportant to the substance of the account of victory. In fact this very detail in vs. 15, the story's resolution, may be related to the use of the poetic saying in vs. 16 more than to the subsequent Form I of vs. 17. Of course, there is no question of a developed report here, since the name is not motivated by the resolution in vs. 15. It appears likely, therefore, that a mixed form appears in a simple report, and merely plays a subordinate role in its wider context.

7. Jgs. 6:24

This verse falls at the close of a passage (vss. 11-24) which presents major problems for analysis. It is clearly to be separated from the Dtr piece in 6:1-10[190] and vss. 25-32 which deal with altogether different themes. Recently, W. Richter[191] has subjected this passage to rigorous and precise examination. He finds various doublets (e.g., 11a//11b; 11a//12a), alternation of messenger names (e.g., מלאך יהוה and מלאך האלהים), and other major thematic inconsistencies (e.g., vss. 14.16 contrast with vss. 22-24; מנחה is merely food for a guest in vs. 18 and an offering for a god in vs. 20). Richter then lifts out two literary layers: vss. 11a.18-19.21-24, and vss. 11b-17. He postulates further that in the oral tradition, the earliest stage spoke of Gideon and a divine visitation; later, the first elements of the altar tradition (vss. 22.24) came in because Gideon was traditionally connected with an altar at Ophra; finally the grounding for the name (vs. 23) was added.[192] Thus the report of naming was not originally connected with the preceding narrative complex (vss. 11a.18-19.21) and the motivation for the particular name given to the altar belongs to a still younger layer of tradition. A key point made by Richter is that in tradition generally, theophany was schematically associated with altar building and naming (Gen. 35:1.3.7 "E"; and Gen. 12:7; 13:14-18; 26:24 f. "J")[193] but not always with etymology (Gen. 12:7; 13:14-18; 26:24 f.). The question is open, then, whether or not in Jgs. 6, even though it is a matter of epiphany more than theophany, the etymological interest reflects a secondary growth in the tradition.

---

[190] Cf. Noth, Studien, p. 51.

[191] Untersuchungen, pp. 122 ff.

Already vs. 23, which presumably makes the etymological word play, is suspect because it breaks the schematic connection of theophany (vss. 21 f.) and altar building (24a). Moreover, the speech in vs. 23 is attributed to Yahweh, a rather abrupt turn of affairs in the context of מלאך יהוה (vss. 21.22). Further, the thematic climax surely falls upon the recognition in vs. 22. In this case the speech in the following verse is at least anti climactic. Hence, there is some support for viewing the etymological elements as secondary accretion.

---

[192] Ibid., pp. 128-144.

[193] In "J", the phrase ליהוה substitutes for the naming. Richter, op. cit., p. 135. One should note that Gen. 33:20 has altar building and naming, but no theophany!

Corroboration is found in the application of our form critical criteria. As the text now stands, an etymological formula (vs. 24ab') receives its direct motivation in the Yahweh speech (vs. 23).[194] The link, however, between motivation and name is surprising, if not atypical. The transition from speech-motivation to name is accomplished neither by assonance, synonym, nor commensurate descriptive response. A word of greeting (שלום לך), in itself odd in the context of a conventional theophany speech, "Fear not . . .,"[195] simply appears again as a part of the name. The step from one to the other is rough and obscures a direct causal relationship. One would have expected normally a name such as "Yahweh gives peace" or a motivation speech such as "I am peace to (for) you." In short, the name given does not reproduce the substance of the motivational speech, and hence represents a breakdown of the conventional pattern. One might even suppose with Richter[196] that the known altar name (without etymology) provided the occasion for the formulation of the greeting in Yahweh's mouth. Moreover, the conventional pattern of etymological report--mixed or otherwise--is not clearly visible here. Significantly, the motivation is separated from the name giving by what under normal circumstances would function as a setting in which the name might arise. In view of the evidence, it seems likely that a genuine etymological etiological report is not present. Rather, one sees the secondary accretion of etymological interests which are expressed in an oddly mixed form.

---

[194] Verse 24b clearly has nothing to do with etymology, since the permanence and location of the altar itself is attested. This is without doubt secondary to the narrative account. (Childs, JBL 82 (1963), pp. 285 f.)

[195] L. Köhler, "Die Offenbarungsformel 'Fürchte dich Nicht' im AT," SthZ 36 (1919), pp. 33-39.

---

[196] *Op. cit.*, p. 132.

SECTION II

SIGNIFICATIVE ETIOLOGY

PART A. *ÔTH* SCHEMA AS ETIOLOGY

I. *Ôth* Formulae

The word *ôth* (אוֹת), which occurs some seventy-nine times in the Old Testament, appears in a rather broad semantic range.[1] In the main, it refers to the following distinct objects:

(1) A prophetic sign-act, e.g. Ezekiel 4:1-3.

(2) Event predicted by prophet as "sign,"
e.g. I Samuel 10:1.7.9; Isaiah 38:7.

(3) Event predicted, but which consists of miraculous, extraordinary happenings, e.g. plagues and wonders in Egypt.

(4) Event not connected with prophets, but a miraculous deed performed by Yahweh alone, e.g. in theophany stories such as Judges 6:11 ff.

(5) Event in the heavens, e.g. Jeremiah 10:2 and in

---

[1] For what follows, cf. C. A. Keller, *Das Wort OTH als Offenbarungszeichen Gottes* (Basel: Hönen, 1946), pp. 49 ff. Cf. also Rengstorf in *Theologische Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament*, ed. G. Kittel (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1964), vol. VII, pp. 207 ff. Sometimes *ôth* occurs parallel with *zikkārōn*. On this word, cf. now W. Schottroff, '*Gedenken*' *im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1964), pp. 299 ff.

Genesis 9:12 ff.

(6) A cultic practice or regulation, e.g. Genesis 17:11.

(7) An event in the *Heilsgeschichte*, or an object which recalls the same, e.g. Joshua 4:6.

An *ôth* most commonly functions to engender knowledge (ידע or דעת); this function is occasionally differentiated to "sight" (e.g. Ps. 86:17), "fear" (e.g. Ps. 65:8 ff.), "hearing" (e.g. Ex. 4:8), or "belief" (e.g. Num. 14:11). Very often function is expressed in a subordinate clause (e.g. introduced by כי Ex. 3:12, or אשר Isa. 38:7, or ש in Jgs. 6:17).[2]

Originally in Israel *ôth* seems to have designated the oracle or sign of revelation through which Yahweh made himself known to his people. Thus God's revelation of will was represented in some objective event which, of course, had to be given an interpretation.[3]

In prophecy, the revelation-sign was used in two ways--as an act to be interpreted and as a predicted and already interpreted event, which was most commonly a miraculous deed of God.

---

[2] Keller, *op*. *cit*., pp. 56 ff.

[3] *Ibid*., pp. 69 ff. for what follows. Keller feels that the roots of usage lie in the world of mantic practices. (Cf. his pp. 81 f.) But cf. the doubts of W. Zimmerli in *ThZ* 5 (1949), pp. 374 ff. The Akkadian word *ittu(m)*, while not certainly cognate with Hebrew *ôth*, shows a similar semantic range, and plays a prominent role in divination. Cf. *CAD* VII, p. 306.

This revelation-sign took on a characteristic of permanence as it was taken over into the stories of the origins of cultic institutions. From this was derived Deuteronomy's metaphorical use as a "sign upon your hand" (Deut. 13:9.16).

A special usage for ôth was given in the traditions connected with Israel in Egypt. Even here, the word occurs mostly in Deuteronomistic layers as a symbol of the uniqueness of God, i.e., the revelation of his being and power shown in his love for his people and their election among the nations.

Finally, the "P" writers took up all these aspects. In working them into a theology of Gnadeordnung, ôth became a "guarantee-sign." Yet the magical roots of the concept and usage are still visible in the independence of this sign, that is in its self-sustaining character (e.g. the rainbow). In this sense, an ôth assures and actualizes God's gracious ordering of the cosmos, mankind, and holy people.

From a form critical point of view, the word ôth obviously appears in a variety of expressions connected with various verbs (e.g. עשה ; שים ; שית ; נתן ; בוא ; הרבה ; שלח).[4] Occasionally, ôth governs a verb, e.g. Ex. 8:19, I Sam. 10:9) but most of the time it occurs in the predicate--often as the object of a transitive verb

---

[4] This analysis moves beyond the fundamental work of Keller at this point.

(e.g. Isa. 66:19; Ps. 135:9; Gen. 4:15; Jgs. 6:17). Depending upon the precise context, ôth can be related to other parts of the predicate with a variety of prepositions. For example:

(1) Most frequently, the preposition is ל, with the person to whom the ôth is given, or upon whom it is laid (e.g. Gen. 4:15) or before whom it is visible (e.g. Ex. 4:30; Jos. 24:17).

(2) Next most often, the preposition is ב translated as "against" (e.g. Dt. 6:22) or "in," "among" (e.g. Dt. 34:11; Num. 14:11). Closely related is the use of על in Isa. 20:3 ("against") and Ps. 105:27 ("among").

(3) Once, the preposition is מן in the expression מֵעִם יהוה (Isa. 7:11).

More significant, however, are the various idiomatic expressions which are frequently attested.

(1) זה לך האות[5]

If one allows for minor variations of gender and number, this expression, a "sign announcement," appears eight times: Ex. 3:12; I Sam. 2:34; 14:10; II Kings 19:29; 20:9 (= Isa. 37:30; 38:7); Jer. 44:29. It always occurs in a speech consisting of three elements whose order can vary somewhat. There is the announcement that there is to be a sign; its meaning is given, along with identification of the event which is to be the sign. The speech is nearly always a divine message, given once as a Yahweh speech (Ex. 3:12) and mostly as a prophetic oracle clearly marked as a word from God. There is only one exception. Jonathan speaks in I Sam. 14:10. In all cases, the *ôth* is a specific natural or supernatural event, predicted to occur at a single point in time in the future.[6]

---

[5] A similar expression זאת אות appears only in Gen. 9:12.17 in the immediate context of a common formula היה לאות. It is considered along with the latter.

(2) מה אות

This interrogative clause occurs two times: II Kings 20:8 and Isa. 38:22. In the former, the question is focused on a specific object in a concrete situation, and directly elicits the prophetic oracle in vss. 9 f. Hence the general contextual features for the question are similar to those noticed with the "sign announcement." Because of textual difficulties,[7] no conclusions can be drawn from Isa. 38:22. As an interrogative formula, however, it is at least not inconsistent with the situation in which someone asked for a specific sign (cf. Isa. 7:11).

---

[6] In I Sam. 14:10 two events are projected into the future as predicted possibilities, one of which is identified as *ôth*.

[7] The verse is fragmentary and out of a proper context. 1 Q Is^a has it in the margin (cf. Millar Burrows, ed. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery* I [New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1950], plate XXXII). The LXX implies Hebrew זה for MT מה (only Symmachus and one miniscule MSS agree with MT).

(3) אות הוא [8]

This idiom is attested three times: Ezek. 4:3; Ex. 31:13.17. The expression always occurs as a part of a Yahweh speech which provides stipulations for future action. Ezek. 4:3 lies close to the many examples of prophets' sign-acts. The phrase designates as *ôth* a concrete action in a definite situation, limited by certain historical conditions. In sharp contrast, Ex. 31:13.17 deal with the Sabbath as a cultic institution and clearly reflect priestly theology. It is important to note that the formula here designates a specific object as a sign, and invests it with a quality of permanence which transcends the limits of specific time points. Moreover, as will become apparent, Ex. 31:13.17 are separable from Ezek. 4:3 because of the former's affinities with another formula common in P tradition.

---

[8] Isa. 7:14 reads לכן יתן אדני הוא לכם אות. This is clearly different from the אות הוא nominal clause. The personal pronoun, masculine here, is used for emphasis. (*GK*^{2} 135a, cf. note 1.)

(4) לאות

This expression appears as a part of the predicate with קשר (Dt. 6:8; 11:18), נתן (Isa. 8:18), שים Ezek. 14:8) and שמר (Num. 17:25). The preposition in all cases is best translated by English "as." This is made clear by Num. 17:25 where Yahweh speaks to Moses, "Put back Aaron's rod before the testimony to be kept as a sign (לאות) for the rebels (לבני מרי)." Always לאות appears in a speech--by Yahweh (Num. 17:25; Ezek. 14:18), by a prophet delivering a divine message (Isa. 8:18), or by Moses (Dt. 6:8; 11:18). The object or event which is designated sign is either specific and limited to one point in time (i.e., in Num. 17:25 and Isa. 8:18) or vaguely defined and existent in all times (as in Ezek. 14:8; Dt. 6:8; 11:18).[9] In no case is the ôth given both a quality of specificity and permanence.

(5) היה לאות

The idiom היה ל , fundamentally equivalent to English "become," narrows in the case of היה לאות and a few other expressions, to the nuance

---

[9] Ps. 74:4 and Isa. 20:3, where אות , without ל occurs, and English "as" must be supplied to convey the meaning, certainly are similar. In both these passages אות is something specific, and is bound to one time point.

"serve as."[10] In this sense one has not strayed far from the usage of לאות described above. The phrase "serve as a sign" (allowing for variation in number and tense) occurs rather frequently in a variety of contexts, and only in relatively late texts:

(a) P material: Gen. 1:14; 9:13; 17:11; Num. 17:3.

(b) D or Dtr materials: Ex. 12:13; 13:9.16; Dt. 28:46; Jos. 4:6 (היה אות).

(c) Late prophetic material: Isa. 19:20; 55:13; Ezek. 20:12.20.[11]

In every case, the idiom appears as a part of a speech--by Yahweh (Gen. 1:14; 9:13; 17:11; Ex. 12:13; Num. 17:3; Ezek. 20:12.20), by a prophet (Isa. 19:20; 55:13), by Moses (Ex. 13:9.16; Dt. 28:46), or Joshua (Jos. 4:6). The speeches are mostly prescriptive, but include as well, threat (Dt. 28:46), accusation (Ezek. 20:12.20), and salvation oracle (Isa. 19:20; 55:13). The meaning of *ôth* in these passages is never a sign-act or a predicted event.

---

[10] On this understanding of the idiom, cf. C. H. Ratschow, *Werden und Wirken: Eine Untersuchung des Wortes 'hajah' als Beitrag zur Wirklichkeitserfassung des Alten Testaments* (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1941), pp. 9 ff.

[11] Ex. 8:19, an earlier text where היה אות occurs, does not yield the sense "serve as a sign." In any case, the citation is of doubtful value, since the LXX implies a different Hebrew reading.

On the one hand, ôth refers to a specific object limited to a single point in time (Ex. 12:13; Isa. 19:20; Ezek. 20:12.20); on the other hand, an object only vaguely specified serves as a sign for all time in Dt. 28:46 and Isa. 55:13. A sign which is both specifically identified and given a quality of permanence without regard for points in time is prescribed in Gen. 9:13 (rainbow), 17:11 (rite of circumcision), Num. 17:3 (altar plate), Ex. 13:9.16 (mazzōth rite; first born sacrifice), Jos. 4:6 (twelve stones at Gilgal).[12]

It is a remarkable fact that of all the idiomatic phrases, and of the seventy-nine times which ôth appears in the Old Testament, only Gen. 9:13; 17:11; Num. 17:3 (היה לאות P material), and Ex. 31:13.17 (אות היא P material), bring together conceptually a specific object designated as ôth and the quality of timeless permanence.[13] Only these passages now pertain to etiology.

---

[12] Gen. 1:14 והיו לאותות must be classified as a special case. Not only is the plural used (elsewhere only singular היה לאות) but the meaning of ôth is very restricted: "They shall serve as signs for the fixed time periods," or "Let them mark the fixed times." (Cf. Speiser, Genesis, p. 6.)

[13] This special characteristic is present also in Ex. 13:9.16 and Jos. 4:6. But these occasions bring היה לאות into proximity with a separate form, the question-answer schema (Ex. 13:14-15; Jos. 4:6-7). Hence they will be discussed as a Mixed Form below in Part IV.

Moreover, these few passages are structured according to a stereotype schema consisting of the following elements:

(1) Identification of an object or rite
(2) Designation as a *ôth*
(היה לאות or אות הִוא)
(3) Meaning of the *ôth* (what it symbolizes, memorializes, recalls)

Of all other seventy-one occurrences of the word, regardless of idiom, only two passages (Ex. 12:13 and Num. 17:25) show a similar pattern, and this without the accent of a timeless permanence. One is justified, then, in looking more closely at this P material, and in considering the passages in question to be examples of a special *genre* connected in some way with the expression of etiological interests.

II. *Oth* Schema as Significative Etiology

Gen. 9:8-17 (P)[14] offers a Yahweh speech--within a minimal narrative framework (vss. 8.12a.17a)--which announces the covenant and its recipients (vss. 9 f.), gives its content (vs. 11), and pronounces its sign (vss. 12-17). Thematically the unit certainly stands apart from vss. 1-7 and the geneology in vss. 18 ff. The speech itself is not smooth.[15]

---

[14] The text is clear, and there are no significant LXX variants. Source critics unanimously assign the material to P (Gunkel, *Genesis*, p. 147; Speiser, *Genesis*, p. 57; von Rad, *Genesis*, p. 129).

[15] Cf. G. von Rad, *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934), pp. 1 ff.

A covenant is given twice (vss. 9 and 11), the "sign" is announced in vss. 12 and 17, the rainbow mentioned two times (vss. 13 and 14), God's remembering twice in vss. 14 and 16. These doublets, according to von Rad, confirm the impression that the present text is a conflation of two earlier recensions: vss. 8.11a.13.16 f. (equals A), and 9 f.11b.12. 14 f. (equals B).

In verse 12 (recension B) the word *ôth* appears in a lengthy nominal clause which is paralleled in vs. 17 (recension A). The formulation (זאת אות־הברית) is attested only here. Since in both cases the clause in no way identifies the "sign," their function is subordinated in this context to vs. 13a. They serve as introduction and conclusion, announcing that a sign of the *berîth* is to be (has been, in vs. 17) given to all future generations. A certain stress, however, falls on vs. 13, as shown by the inverted word order. It is here, both in version A (vss. 13.16) and the combined recension (vss. 13-16), that the idiom היה לאות occurs as part of the *ôth* schema:

(1) x identified: vs. 13a, "My bow I set in the cloud"

(2) x designated *ôth*: vs. 13b, והיתה לאות ברית

(3) Meaning of x as *ôth*: vs. 16

The sign formula is most reasonably translated as a future tense, "and it (the bow) shall serve as a sign of the covenant. . . ."[16] Theoretically, of course, one may read a simple waw and retain a past sense for the qatal verb form.[17] In the context, however, this seems highly unlikely. The blessing given in vss. 1b-7 seems clearly open toward the future (imperatives--vss. 1b.7--and a series of yiqtal verb forms--vss. 2.5). The phraseology in vs. 11a (ולא יכרת כל-בשר עוד), and the temporal clause in vs. 16a (both in recension A) certainly look toward a future time. The wider context, therefore, provides warrant for reading vs. 13b as a future tense. The ôth formula points toward a future which begins in the present because now the bow is set in the cloud.

---

[16] So F. R. Blake, *A Resurvey of Hebrew Tenses* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1951), prgr. 351'.

Moreover, the ôth itself is given a quality of permanence. The bow functions (vs. 16) to recall the promise, i.e., the covenant, forever. This fact is confirmed even in the combined recension, for the "sign of the covenant" (vs. 12) is established as existent for all subsequent points in time with the characteristically P phrase לדרת עולם .[18] From the viewpoint of the reader or hearer, therefore, something specific (the rainbow) as ôth has existed from the past of Noah's time to the present of the hearer's generation, and will continue to exist in the future. The bow possesses an independent power before Yahweh and men to recall or memorialize for all time the promise given.[19] At Yahweh's command, it serves as a memory sign, as a way of actualizing again and again the promise of vs. 16.[20] In this context, then, the ôth schema serves primarily to provide the meaning of the rainbow. The form functions to present a significative etiology, that is, an explanation of the "sign-ness" of the bow, what it recalls and guarantees forever. Of course, in light of the wider context, particularly vss. 11a and vss. 1-7, one cannot overlook a certain broadening of perspective within the whole priestly theology.[21] But in itself, one can see the ôth schema expressing and emphasizing the significance of the bow for the ordering of Israel's existence.

---

[17] Ibid., prgr. 37a'.

[18] לדרתם or לדרתיכם in Gen. 17:7.9.12; Ex. 12:14.17.42; 16:32.33; Lev. 3:17; 6:11; 7:36; Num. 9:10; 10:8 et al. (For a complete listing, cf. S. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament [second edition; New York: Scribners, 1913], p. 132.) עולם is usually associated with חק or חוקה Lev. 10:9; 23:14.31.41 et al., but more often with לדרתיכם or לדרתם as in Ex. 12:14.17; Lev. 3:17; Num. 10:8; 15:15; 18:23 et al.

Gen. 17:9-14 offers another divine speech with only a minimal narrative setting (vs. 9a). Here God speaks to Abraham, commands the observance of the covenant, and provides its content by prescribing circumcision. Clearly P material,[22] the section is separated from the surrounding traditions by the narrative formulae (vss. 9a.15a). It surely has nothing to do with vss. 15 ff. which deal with a covenant with Isaac. Yet vss. 9-14 are not unified. On the one hand, vss. 10-12a. 13b are cast as a direct speech mostly in plural address style.[23] On the other hand, vss. 12b-13a specify detailed prescriptions in a singular address form. Moreover, vs. 14 is impersonally cast in a style at least reminiscent of a conventional type of legislation (cf. Ex. 12:15.19; 31:14; Num. 9:13; Lev. 7:20 f.; 17:9; 19:8 _et al_.).[24] One might conclude from this disarray, as does von Rad,[25] that an earlier layer (vss. 9-12a.13b) has been secondarily expanded by the detailed prescriptions (vss. 12b-13a), and perhaps by vs. 14.[26]

---

[19] On a probable mythological background for this divine bow ("my bow" vs. 13a), cf. Gunkel, Genesis, p. 151.

[20] Only in relation to the wider context can one generalize at this point and speak of the sign guaranteeing the "Gnadeordnung" (Keller, op. cit., p. 132), or the "stability of nature" (von Rad, Genesis, p. 130).

[21] Keller, op. cit., pp. 130 ff.

[22] Cf. commentators. E.g., Gunkel, Genesis, p. 264; Speiser, Genesis, p. 122.

If such an understanding be correct, then the sign formula, as well as the entire _ôth_ schema is contained in the

---

[23] Only the minor זרעך אחריך disturbs this pattern.

[24] For a study of this formula, cf. W. Zimmerli, "Die Eigenart der Prophetischen Rede des Ezechiel," _ZAW_ n.f. 25 (1954), pp. 13 ff.

[25] _Priesterschrift_, pp. 22-24.

[26] The final form of vss. 10b-13, however, shows a certain symmetry which may, after all, turn out to be characteristic for much of redacted P legislation:

A Stipulation: vss. 10b-11a
B It is a "sign of the _berîth_": vs. 11b

A' Stipulation: vss. 12-13a
B' Covenant is "everlasting": vs. 13b

earlier tradition. The elements:

(1) X identified (circumcision prescribed): vss. 10b-11a

(2) X designated ôth:vs. 11b

והיה לאות ברית[27]

(3) Meaning of X as ôth

The ôth formula should be read with conversive waw as future tense. The whole section is oriented toward the future--or at least general present--in the manner of legislation, and demands a certain openness to the future. The phrase זרעך אחריך (vs. 10b) points to a similar conclusion.

The ôth itself is given a quality of permanence without regard for specific points in time. Already the earlier tradition understood the sign, i.e., the rite of circumcision, to be applicable to the generations following Abraham (vs. 10b). The later expansions were more explicit: vs. 12a לדרתיכם ; vs. 13b לברית עולם . One sees, therefore, that the sign has existed from the past of Abraham into the present and indefinite future. The ritual act prescribed is the sign of God's covenant.[28] It recalls, memorializes, points to, the special relationship between God and Abraham;

---

[27] Two MSS, S, and a MSS of Targum read והיתה , presumably in agreement with the preceding ערלתכם . Perhaps, however, the feminine singular refers to the whole clause. Cf. GK^2, prgr. 144b.

[28] The third singular masculine והיה has as its antecedent the preceding clause (cf. GK^2, prgr. 144b).

and it marks each participant as a bona fide descendant of Abraham.[29] Like Gen. 9:13 ff., the *ôth* schema here presents a significative etiology. It expresses the "sign-ness" of a cultic rite certainly known and presupposed in the priestly theology (cf. Lev. 12:3). Through its designation as sign of the covenant, circumcision is both commanded and explained as a meaningful memory sign in the ordering of God and people.

A similar situation is apparent in Num. 17:1-5. Following the destruction of Korah and company, Moses receives a series of commands, each with its own motive clause. He is to take up the censers belonging to Korah's men, scatter the fire, and hammer the pots into an altar covering. The latter is to serve as a sign (vs. 3), a reminder (*zikkārōn*) to the Israelites.[30]

---

[29] Cf. further on the theological significance, Keller, *op*. *cit*., p. 135.

[30] There are several textual problems. (1) MT כי קדשו — בנפשתם (vss. 2-3a). As the Hebrew reads, a stative (קדשו) governs an accusative. The Greek MSS mostly read " τ ηγιασαν τα πυρεια των αμαρτωλων τουτων ...... ψυχαις αυτων thus implying MT and probably reading the D stem קִדְּשׁוּ . A few versions, however, have ηγιασθησαν . A movement from the pure operation of stative verbs to that of an active verb is attested elsewhere (cf. *GK*^{2}, prgr. 117, note 2). Gray (*Numbers*, p. 211) drops MT את and takes המחתות to be subject of קדשו . In any case the meaning is clear: the censers are now sanctified and therefore warrant the extraordinary commands given in vs. 2. (2) For MT וְעָשׂוּ , read imperative וַעֲשֵׂה with some Greek MSS and Syriac. This is parallel, then, to the preceding אֱמֹר and זָרֵה . (3) MT ויהיו (vs. 3b); S reads והיו and the LXX reads a past tense (εγενοντο ; a few read εγενετο). On the basis of parallel *ôth* passages, a future sense in the *ôth* formula is likely; also the resumption of a narrative tense at this point is awkward and abrupt. Therefore the Greek reading is not probable.

Commentators generally agree in assigning these five verses to a priestly redactor.[31] They are clearly independent of vss. 6 ff. There are no points of contact with the earlier material preserved in 16:12-15.25-34. Therefore, on the level of tradition history, vss. 1-5 were linked up only with the later form of the preceding Korah tradition. Yet even this connection is loose, as is shown in the rather forced linkage brought about in vs. 5.

The piece is made up of narrative elements (vss. 1 and 4), a Yahweh speech (vss. 2 f.), and a reflective comment (vs. 5).[32] The whole is organized loosely according to the ôth schema:

(1) X is identified (making of altar plates prescribed): vss. 2-3a

(2) X designated ôth: vs. 3b

(3) Meaning of X as ôth: vs. 5

The ôth formula, as in Gen. 9 and 17, is best translated with a future sense: "They shall serve as an ôth," or "Let them serve as an ôth. . . ." The pointing of the verb יהיו ,

---

[31] E.g., Baentsch, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, pp. 549 f.; H. Holzinger, Numeri, p. 66; Gray, Numbers, p. 208.

[32] The breakdown of strict narrative style in vs. 5 is seen in the generalized impersonal formulation of the למען, אשר clause. Also, the phrase b^e^yad Mosheh in Numbers never occurs in strict narrative. It is, rather, a redactional feature having no special narrative function. Cf. 33:1 (superscription); 9:23; 27:23, 36:13, 4:37.45.49 (concluding formulae); 10:13 (digressive tabulation of facts); 15:23 (legal prescription).

in contrast to the immediately preceding narrative tense, indicates as much. Moreover, the general prescriptive character of the whole speech suggests a certain openness to the future.

More importantly, the sign has a significance which is not limited to a particular point in time. The ôth formula itself expresses this characteristic. It is a sign to the "Israelites"--not those said to participate in the events of Korah's rebellion, for the phrase בני ישראל only occurs in 16:2 in a special bound phrase--but to those Israelites who live in future generations.

One has only to contrast the timebound significance of the "sign" in 17:25 where Aaron's blooming staff is to be an ôth to the rebels (לבני מרי) that "you (Moses) may make an end to their murmurings. . . ." Here the fact and meaning of the sign is rooted in the preceding narrative of rebellion (17:16 ff.). It has meaning only at this specific point in time, i.e., to those particular rebels. Now in 17:3, one begins to see that the very lack of specificity in the expression והיו לאות לבני ישראל, points to an openness to an indefinite future which gives permanent significance to the "sign," namely, the altar covering. This understanding is confirmed in the wider ôth schema also. The "sign" stands parallel to zikkārōn of vs. 5, which is to be a reminder for generations after Aaron (לזרע אהרן). It is further corroborated by the clause beginning with למען אשר (vs. 5), which is impersonally formulated to suggest its applicability, like legislation, in every subsequent and similar situation.

Hence a specific object, the altar covering, has been given a quality of permanence as a sign, as a reminder of Korah's fate, as a mark of Aaron's special privilege before Yahweh's altar in all generations. The *ôth* schema in itself, therefore, functions as a significative etiology when it explains the "sign-ness" of an altar covering which elsewhere is simply prescribed (Ex. 27:1 ff.; 38:1 ff.).[33]

The situation is more complex in Ex. 31:12-17. In the context of diverse cultic prescriptions linked together loosely by a minimal narrative framework (Ex. 30:11.17.22.34; 31:1.12.18), Yahweh commands the people through Moses to observe the Sabbath (vs. 13a).[34] There follow in vss. 13b-17 very complex traditions circling in various ways about this fundamental theme.

---

[33] W. Schottroff, ('*Gedenken*,' p. 317), echos most commentators in judging Num. 17:1-5 as a secondary piece with "etiological tendency."

[34] On the form of the command, cf. Lev. 19:3.30; 26:2. The use of *wayyōmer* in this introductory formula (vs. 12) is rare in P material, where the usual expression employs *way^{e}dabber*. Cf., for example, Ex. 25:1; 30:11.17.22; 31:1; 40:1 *et al*. But cf. Lev. 16:2; 21:1. The formula does not necessarily indicate a literary break in the material. Cf. its use in Lev. 22:26 in the midst of a single collection of law (Lev. 22:17-30). Not even the *waw* following לאמר (vs. 13) signals a break. Such usage is common in priestly formulations. Cf. Lev. 16:2; 20:1; Ex. 30:17 f.22 f. (the latter has ואתה). The use of *'ak* here in Ex. 31:13 indicates that we are to read what follows in close relationship with the preceding regulations. (Cf. Lev. 23:27.39; 27:26.28.)

Commentators generally agree that these verses stem from priestly redaction.[35] There are numerous points of tension. Verse 14a essentially repeats vs. 13; vs. 14b shows two conventional legal formulations, each having a distinctive Sitz-im-Leben and history. On the one hand there is מחלליה מות יומת;[36] on the other, something like a casuistic form כי העשה בה מלאכה ונכרתה.[37] Verses 15 ff. take up the theme again in what appears to be a secondary expansion.[38] But even here there is clumsiness of formulation; verses 15 and 17b refer to Yahweh in the third person and vs. 17a appears to be spoken by Yahweh himself. Moreover, vs. 16 begins again a Sabbath commandment following the self-contained law of vs. 15. (Cf. Ex. 35:2; Lev. 23:3 et al.)

The complexity of the whole fabric undoubtedly stems partly from obscure developments in pre-literary history; literary analysis, therefore, is unable to resolve all the problems.[39] Fully aware of the difficulties, however, one can examine the *ôth* material here simply because it appears to have been included in fairly distinct tradition stages, which still assert their independence within the whole complex.

---

[35] Cf. Holzinger, Exodus, p. 147; Baentsch, Exodus-Lev-Num, pp. 267 ff.; Driver, Exodus, p. 344; Beer, Exodus, pp. 151 f.; Noth, Exodus, p. 241. Cf. also von Rad, Priesterschrift, pp. 62 ff.

[36] Cf. A. Alt, "The Origins of Israelite Law" in his collection Essays on Old Testament History and Religion (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), pp. 103 ff.; the German original in Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel, vol. I (Munich: Beck, 1959).

[37] Ibid., p. 112, note 74, where Alt speculates that the original text may have been closer to the pure apodictic formulation. In any case the tension between the two forms dealing with the same subject in the same verse is unmistakable. On casuistic law in general, cf. ibid., pp. 88 ff.

[38] Cf. Noth, Exodus, pp. 204 f.

Verse 13 stands out first. Following a command in second plural address, a *kî* motive clause identifies the Sabbath as an *ôth* whose significance is given in the infinitival clause immediately following. The *ôth* schema is operative here.

(1) X is identified (Sabbath prescribed)

(2) X is an *ôth* אות היא

(3) Meaning of X as *ôth*

The nominal clause *ôth* formula, of course, is different from that in Gen. 9:13; 17:11 and Num. 17:3. Yet its scope is comparable. It plays the expected role in the larger schematic structure, identifies a given specific object as a "sign," and within itself attests to the latter's permanence in all time (לדרתיכם).

A certain modification has taken place, however. The context indicates that כי אות היא be read most naturally as a present tense. Insofar as the *ôth* formula, then, functions as a present tense motive clause, it makes an appeal to a state of affairs already presupposed.[40] Thus strictly speaking, the ôth formula does not designate the Sabbath as a sign, but cites its "sign-ness" as a reason for obeying the law. This slight modification comes about because the dominant interest here is in the prescription. The inverted word order את־שבתתי תשמרו, as well as the syntactical subordination of the ôth formula, definitely point in this direction.

---

[39] Compare the commentators' attempts, and von Rad, *Priesterschrift*, pp. 62 ff.

In view of this shift in functions, one cannot speak simply of an ôth schema presenting a significative etiology in vs. 13. Insofar as the command in its formulation attests to the "sign-ness" of the Sabbath as a specific reality for all time, the special etiological interests are expressed. But the movement away from simply presenting an observance or object along with its "sign-ness," as in Gen. 9 and 17 and Num. 17, must be recognized. Perhaps even a certain deterioration in the form is visible in this functional shift.

Verses 16 f. (ôth in vs. 17a), only thematically connected to what precedes, present a different picture. Short of postulating vs. 17a to be a literary gloss, for which good evidence is lacking, there seems to be no way of resolving the tensions in the text between an impersonal third person style (vss. 16.17b) and a first person speech

---

[40] Cf. B. Gemser, "Motive Clauses in the Old Testament" in Supplements to VT, vol. I (1953), pp. 50 ff. On the various kinds of appeals, classified according to content, cf. pp. 55 ff.

(vs. 17a).[41] But on the level of the final redaction of the text, there is good reason for taking vss. 16 f. as a unified Yahweh speech.

(1) The occurrence of בני ישראל in both vss. 16 and 17 reflects a common stance with regard to the hearer of the command. In vs. 16 it is possible to understand ושמרו as an indirect imperative: "And let the Israelites keep the Sabbath. . . ." There is no grammatical awkwardness in this construction, even in direct address. Cf. Gen. 41:33 f., for example.

(2) It is not impossible that the speaker (Yahweh) slips easily back and forth between direct address in the second person, third person indirect address, or impersonally formulated legal prescription. A case in point is Lev. 22:3. Here is found a Yahweh speech to Moses with the second person address suffixes (לדרתיכם / מכל זרעכם), an impersonally formulated bit of legislation (כל איש אשר־ יקרב), and references to the speaker (Yahweh) in both third and first persons (ליהוה ; מלפני ; אני יהוה).[42]

---

[41] I take vs. 15 to be a self-contained unit, originally independent of vss. 13 ff. and 16 ff. Cf. above, p. 136.

[42] LXX presupposes Hebrew אלהיכם , second plural address.

All this probably points to heavy editing.[43] Yet clearly vs. 3 is to be understood in its final mixed form as a unified piece of legislation. This sort of clumsy formulation is by no means rare in priestly material, especially in tradition blocks bearing the marks of old legal material having been reworked for a later age. (Cf. Lev. 17:12-16; 21:16-23; 23:28-30.) One is not surprised, therefore, to find in the case of Ex. 31:16-17 similar fluctuations. Since it is clearly a question of material edited by priestly writers, the fluctuations do not count decisively against understanding the two verses as a redactional unit.[44]

(3) The asyndetic beginning of vs. 17 requires the context supplied by vs. 16.

---

[43] Cf. R. Kilian, Literarkritische und Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes (Bonn: Hanstein, 1963), p. 92. Also H. Reventlow, Das Heiligkeitsgesetz (Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1961), pp. 97 ff. Cf. however, K. Elliger, Leviticus (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966), p. 285, who explains the fluctuation in style by a late author's familiarity and dependence upon customary formulae.

[44] Cf. further Ex. 24:1.2 and Gen. 9:16, both Yahweh speeches in which the speaker refers to himself in the third person. In poetry, of course, the stylistic feature is well known. Cf. for example, Job 40:2.9.19; Isa. 49:7; 51:3. In Ugaritic, cf. texts 51:III:15 ff.; 51:IV:36 ff.; 76:II:20 ff.; 77:18. Cf. C. C. Torrey in JAOS 57 (1937), pp. 405 ff. and S. Gewirtz in VT 11 (1961), p. 147, note 4.

We therefore are justified in considering vss. 16-17 at least in its final form, as a unified Yahweh speech. As such, the verses assume a pattern which is regularly found in priestly legal materials: a law is prescribed, and is followed immediately by a reflective comment--not a motive clause--often expressed by a nominal clause. (Cf. Num. 18:23; Ex. 27:21; 28:43 *et al.*) Now the *ôth* formula in vs. 17a is a part of the reflective comment, and at the same time functions in the *ôth* schema:

(1) X identified : vs. 16 (Sabbath prescribed)

(2) X is an *ôth*: vs. 17a אות היא.

(3) Meaning of X as *ôth*: vs. 17b

As in vs. 13, the *ôth* formula, while formally distinct, functions similarly to the היה לאות form of Gen. 9.17 and Num. 17. Its position in the larger schematic structure as well as its marking a specific object as a sign for all times, confirms this judgment. Already vs. 16 has specified the permanence of the Sabbath and its observance.[45] One should note, however, the possibility that the *ôth* formula stands closer to a legal motive clause, as did vs. 13, than do the examples of היה לאות . There is ambiguity in the nominal clause insofar as it can be read as a statement of a presupposed or known situation rather than merely a designation of Sabbath as ôth. Again, the beginnings of a breakdown in a conventional ôth formula are perhaps visible.

---

[45] Verse 16 stresses the observance which is to be an ordinance forever (taking *berîth* in its derived sense of "law" or "ordinance." Cf. Lev. 24:8 and Keller, *OTH*, p. 141.)

The sign is not a mark of Israel's holiness as was the case in vs. 13. Rather its significance as sign lies in its recalling the majestic fabric of Gen. 1-2:4a, or more specifically, the six days of creation work, and the seventh day of rest (cf. Ex. 20:11; Gen. 2:3). A vestige of an etymological word play may remain in the assonance of שַׁבָּת and שָׁבַת (cf. Gen. 2:2). Accordingly we must not overlook a certain interest in the origin of the Sabbath and its name. Yet the formulation chiefly presents the demand for observance, and the "sign-ness" of the Sabbath. To this extent, the ôth schema of vss. 16 f. functions as significative etiology; it explains the Sabbath as a commanded reality, and its meaning as a memory sign recalling Yahweh's creative acts in ordering the primeval cosmos.

To summarize: a formula היה לאות is used in P materials to designate a specific object or cultic rite as a sign which recalls permanently something of specified content and import in the priestly view of God's ordering of the world. The formula, read as a future tense, occurs always in the midst of a fixed structure which functions as a whole to provide a significative etiology, that is, the meaning for all time of a specific and already known act or object.[46] The deterioration of this etiological form was observed in Ex. 31:13.17 where the formula appears as a nominal clause (אות הִיא), which tended to presuppose rather than divulge or designate the "signship" of a given object.

---

[46] Num. 15:37-40 is very similar to this ôth form, but contains neither the word ôth, nor a synonym.

PART B. THE QUESTION-ANSWER SCHEMA AS ETIOLOGY

J. A. Soggin has isolated five occasions, all of which are related to cultic matters, on which children ask their fathers about the origins of a cultic practice or a sanctuary with peculiar features: Ex. 12:26 ff.; 13:14 ff.; Dt. 6:20 ff.; Jos. 4:6 ff.21 ff. In a few other passages such occasions are probably implicit: Dt. 4:10 ff.; 6:7 ff.; 11:19 ff.[47] The question-answer scheme is reproduced with remarkable rigidity. Soggin understands all the contexts variously as etiological. In Dt. 6:20 ff. the "credo" serves as the etiology of the observance of law; Ex. 12:24-27 and 13:11-16 presuppose a cultic frame of reference, and must therefore be understood etiologically; in Jos. 4:6 ff.21 ff. it is a question of an etiology of the sanctuary at Gilgal, in which twelve stones certainly played a role. Their presence is explained with an etiological saga.[48] Because of their peculiarly specialized character, Soggin supposes that these five passages preserve fragments of an old catechism wherein question and answer were asked and given liturgically. In such a way, elemental instruction into important matters of the Israelite cult was accomplished.[49]

---

[47] J. A. Soggin, "Kultätiologische Sagen und Katechese im Hexateuch," VT 10 (1960), pp. 341-347. Cf. also L. Köhler, Hebrew Man (London: SCM Press, 1956; ET of German 1953 edition), pp. 79 f. Cf. further, Dt. 32:7.

[48] Soggin, *op*. *cit*., pp. 342 ff.

Disregarding for the moment those two occurrences which lie in proximity to the word ôth (i.e. Jos. 4:6 f. and Ex. 13:14-16), this question-answer schema always appears as a conditional sentence. A protasis (temporal clause) contains the question which the children are to ask, and the apodosis prescribes the appropriate answer.[50] A typical full form occurs in Ex. 12:26:

(1) והיה כי יאמרו אליכם בניכם
מה העבדה הזאת לכם

(2) ואמרתם

(then follows the answer)

There are, of course, minor variations in the protasis. The temporal expression והיה כי is replaced by אשר in

---

[49] Ibid., pp. 344 ff.

[50] A search for parallels to the cases cited by Soggin yielded nothing. Jos. 22:24 (noted by Soggin) and Gen. 32:17 f. show at most that a similar formal structure can be used in quite dissimilar circumstances. Occurrences of interrogative idioms show a diversity of usage, but nothing parallel to Soggin's "catechetical" question. Cf., for example, the uses of מה זה , מה זאת , מה ל and מה (noun) ל . The latter idiom appears in two of Soggin's passages: Ex. 12:26 (מה העבדה הזאת לכם) and Jos. 4:6 (מה האבנים האלה לכם). Its nuance here seems to be "what does so and so mean to you?" Cf. Ezek. 37:18, and probably II Sam. 16:2; Ezek. 12:22; Joel 4:4. It is significant, however, that an inquiry into the meaning or interpretation of something can be expressed by a nominal clause without the preposition ל , e.g., the late vision formulae: Zach. 1:9; 4:4; 6:4 or Gen. 21:29. In any case, no parallels for Soggin's five cases are attested.

Jos. 4:21,[51] and is shortened to כי in Dt. 6:20;[52] the yiqtal verb is ישאל in Jos. 4:21 and Dt. 6:20; both of these passages in addition show an adverbial מחר which opens the prescription to the indefinite future; often לאמר introduces the quotation. The question itself is always in the form of a nominal clause, introduced by the interrogative מה , and sometimes containing the dative expression לכם (Ex. 12:26).[53] As judged from the variety of interests expressed in the prescribed answer, the exact sense of the question is ambiguous, extending over and including nuances as "why so and so?", "what does so and so mean?", "what is so and so?"

The prescribed answer (apodosis) always begins with a simple waw and qatal verb form (ואמרתם or ואמרת ; once והודעתם in Jos. 4:22). There follows another quotation--the answer--given as a recitation in the style of a "credo," e.g. Dt. 6:21 ff.;[54] Ex. 12:27; Jos. 4:22b. The items recited are various, and demand closer study.

---

[51] Cf. GK^2, prgr. 164d.

[52] Some versions read והיה however.

[53] Even the lengthy expression in Dt. 6:20b fits the pattern, since the ʾašr clause is subordinate to the main nominal clause.

[54] Cf. G. von Rad, "The Form-Critical Problem of the Hexateuch," in The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 1 ff.

In Ex. 12:27a,[55] the quoted recitation provides an explanation for the name of the Passover rite in a way reminiscent of the etymological etiological report. An assonantal word play provides the causal link between the named observance (זֶבַח־פֶּסַח) and an act of Yahweh in the past (פָּסַח). But also, the Passover rite recalls for all generations (vs. 24) that complex of traditions which describe the last evening in Egypt, and which are capsulated in the recited answer of vs. 27. Thus the question-answer schema functions etiologically: it provides the explanation of name and origin of a cultic observance. But also, it functions as a significative etiology insofar as it summarizes the essential tradition facts which the rite recalls and memorializes. The form of the question, "what does this service mean to you?" already points in this direction.

Similarly in Jos. 4:22b[56] the prescribed answer summarizes the tradition events with which twelve stones were associated. As such, the recitation neither identifies the stones nor explains their origin. Rather it capsulates that which the stones memorialize, and to this extent explains them as a memory sign. This seems clear even though the word ôth does not appear in the text. Hence, the question-answer schema (vss. 21-22), in addition to providing for instruction, functions in a significative way, and brings one close to the operation of the ôth form as a significative etiology. The final redaction, of course, shifts ground, and has these twelve stones engendering knowledge and reverence analogously to ôth in, for example, Dt. 4:35.

---

[55] Verse 27b resumes the third person narrative, and thus is not a part of the prescriptive question-answer schema.

[56] The rough transition to vs. 23, as well as the change to second plural address style (although the Greek MSS are more harmonious with vs. 22b in this respect) indicate that vss. 23 f. did not originally belong in this question-answer schema. (Cf. Noth, Josua, p. 39.)

The picture is somewhat more diffuse in Dt. 6:21-25. The prescribed answer recites the essential points in Israel's Heilsgeschichte (slavery, exodus, and receipt of the land), and the giving of law (חקים).[57] But the homiletical interest so characteristic of Deuteronomy in general is vividly expressed not only by the context in which the question-answer schema is placed (vss. 1-19), but by the final statements in the quoted answer (vss. 24b-25) which seek to induce obedience, which in turn is "righteousness." In view of the diversity of elements within the answer, the children's question cannot simply ask for the origin of law, or its contents, or its meaning as some sort of memory-sign recalling Yahweh's past saving acts. One must say, rather, that in broad terms, the questioner seeks the significance of the divine statutes.[58] But the prescribed answer moves beyond interests in origin and those events which law recalls, to inculcating obedience. Only in this special sense--unparalleled elsewhere--can one say that the question-answer schema functions in a significative way. The undeniable etiological elements are focused, therefore, on quite a specific goal.

---

[57] There is little evidence for restricting the scope of חקים here. It likely refers to the totality of Israel's legal traditions, and thus to the entire phrase of vs. 20b. Cf. N. Lohfink, Das Hauptgebot (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965), pp. 54 f.

In summary, the function of the question-answer schema is nuanced to a fair degree. Yet the three cases examined each provide for instruction of future generations and prescribe the significance of a special object--twelve stones at Gilgal, Passover rite, Law. Two of the three passages (Ex. 12:24-26; Jos. 4:21 f.) clearly functioned to define that which the object in question recalled or memorialized for future generations. In the third case (Dt. 6:20 ff.), the blurring of focus on this particular concern is likely due to Deuteronomy's dominant homiletical style and interest. One sees, therefore, that the question-answer structure has a function very similar to that of the *ôth* schema previously identified as a significative etiology.

This judgment is confirmed by two striking instances in which the two schemata merge: Ex. 13:11-16 and Jos. 4:6 f.

---

[58] Cf. von Rad, *Deuteronomy* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966; ET of German first edition), p. 65.

1. Ex. 13:1-16

Commentators have generally agreed that Ex. 13:1-16 is a composite section comprised of at least three distinct parts: vss. 1-2; vss. 3-10; vss. 11-16. The disagreement came in how one describes precisely their origins--as R^D and P (vss. 1-2),[59] or Deuteronomistic type material with later addition in vss. 1-2,[60] or proto-Deuteronomy tradition.[61]

Now within the complex vss. 11-16, and following a common legal formulation,[62] the question-answer schema appears (vss. 14-15). It is certainly to be understood as a continuation of vss. 11-13. The elements of the schema are typical. The prescribed answer to the children's question recites the essential tradition facts which explain both the origin and reason for a particular sacrificial practice simply prescribed in an older text (Ex. 22:28 f.). The formulation makes clear that the sacrifice of Israel's first born is in commemoration of Yahweh's deed in Egypt. In this sense, as in the pure examples of question-answer schemata, one has come near the *ôth* significative etiology which provides the meaning of an object as memory sign.

---

[59] So the older commentators, e.g. Baentsch, Exodus, Leviticus, Numeri, pp. 108 f. and Beer, Exodus, pp. 71 f.

[60] So Noth, Pentateuch, p. 32, note 106.

[61] So N. Lohfink, Hauptgebot, pp. 116 ff. Chr. Brekelmans has rightly called for more precision in the terminology of such materials, and to this end sets out several criteria. Cf. his "Die Sogenannten Deuteronomischen Elemente in Gen.-Num.," Suppl. VT, vol. 15 (1965), pp. 90-96.

[62] Cf. Lohfink, op. cit., pp. 113 ff.

Indeed, an *ôth* formula appears as the final statement in the prescribed answer (vs. 16):

והיה לאות על־ידכה

The formula is set in the midst of a larger *ôth* schema which now surrounds the question-answer form as a framework:

(1) X identified (first born sacrifice prescribed): vss. 11-13.

(2) X is an *ôth*: vs. 16a.

(3) Meaning of X as *ôth*: vs. 16b.

Here, of course, it is not a question of a sacrificial practice being designated a real symbol in the sense that circumcision can be a "sign" (Gen. 17:11). The localization of the *ôth* "on your hand" (parallel to *ṭōṭāphōth* "between your eyes") suggests that the whole formula is to be understood metaphorically.[63] Yet its import is certainly what one would expect. First born sacrifice as *ôth* points beyond itself to a significance given by the following *kî* clause. The sacrifice recalls or memorializes the exodus (vs. 16b). In itself, therefore, the *ôth* schema functions typically to provide a significative etiology, insofar as it explains the "sign-ness" of a particular sacrificial practice.

---

[63] Cf. Noth, *Exodus*, pp. 101 f. The probability that טוטפות is a technical term for an ancient practice involving specific objects (perhaps beads), also forces one to see a metaphorical usage here.

The remarkable fact is that in combination, the form of neither the ôth nor the question-answer schemata has been significantly altered. Moreover, each form retains its individual function. This very lack of alteration indicates that both forms have one function in common, namely significative etiology. This is simply reinforced in the merger.

The situation in vss. 3-10 is similar, but less clear. Reminiscent of vs. 16, an ôth formula appears in vs. 9 in the midst of prescriptive legislation structured somewhat loosely according to the ôth schema:

(1) X identified (observance prescribed): vss. 5-7

(2) X is an ôth: vs. 9[64]

והיה לך לאות על-ידך

(3) Meaning of X as ôth: vs. 9b

As with vs. 16, the ôth formula is to be taken as a metaphor. It remains clear, however, that the Mazzôth observance is understood as a memory sign (אות // זכרון) which recalls Yahweh's act of deliverance from Egypt. The ôth schema therefore typically functions to order an observance and to establish and explain its "sign-ness" for all time (vs. 10 מימים ימימה).

---

[64] For MT והיה , S reads והיו . Even if it is expressed an indefinite subject, a plural has no clear referent in the context.

It is significant that the schema is broken by vs. 8, a provision for instruction of future generations: "And you shall tell your son on that day, 'Because of this (which) Yahweh did for me when I came out of Egypt.'"[65] The similarity to the quoted reply in the question-answer schema is obvious and allows one to suppose that a fragment of such remains in the text at this point. The parallel in structure between vss. 5-10 and 11-16, and the clear question-answer from within the latter, points to the same conclusion.[66] If this be correct, then one sees immediately that the *ôth* schema has not been significantly altered in combination with elements of a question-answer form.

2. Jos. 4:6-7

Chapters 3 and 4 present an unusually complex literary picture which has defied satisfactory solution. The supposition of a plurality of independent narrative strata here, whether identified with Pentateuchal sources,[67] or "versions,"[68] has not led to illuminating results. Because the middlepoint of the whole, the "disappearance" of the Jordan waters, is clearly enough reported only once, Noth[69] supposes that one basic tradition of the crossing has been elaborated by many hands. Accordingly, Noth identifies in chapter 4, vss. 1b-2, most of vs. 3, most of vss. 8-10, vss. 13.18b.19-21a.23 as the original layer of tradition which explained twelve stones in terms of the Jordan crossing. In his view, vss. 4 f. reflect younger tradition, and vss. 6-7 younger still.

---

[65] The text may be corrupt, as בעבור זה is very unusual.

[66] Cf. N. Lohfink, *Hauptgebot*, p. 116, note 9.

[67] E.g., Gressmann, *Anfänge*, pp. 130 ff. and recently, O. Eissfeldt, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (New York: Harper and Row, 1965; ET of German third edition), pp. 248 ff.

[68] E.g., Möhlenbrink, "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," *ZAW* 15 (1938), pp. 254 ff. and J. Dus, "Die Analyse zweier Ladeerzählung des Josuabuches (Jos. 3-4 und 6)," *ZAW* 72 (1960), pp. 107-134; also, P. Saydon, "The Crossing of the Jordan," *CBQ* 12 (1950), pp. 194-207 and E. Vogt, "Die Erzählung vom Jordanübergang," *Biblica* 46 (1965), pp. 125-148.

Whether or not one accepts Noth's understanding (and I am convinced of its general correctness), it is clear that vss. 4-7 interrupt the smooth transition from vss. 3 to 8. The command issued by Joshua in vs. 5 lacks the crucial element prescribed in vs. 3, namely taking the stones to the lodging place. Moreover, the expansive instructions in vss. 4 ff. are much too broad to be included in the purview of vs. 8a. Therefore, vss. 4-7 are rightly understood at least as an independent layer, and perhaps as a literary addition to older tradition.

Following a brief narrative statement (vss. 4-5a), Joshua commands the selection of twelve stones "that this may be an _ôth_." The typical question-answer schema follows, and prescribes the stones' meaning which is to be taught future generations.[70] The focus is clearly on the stones as a memorial forever (" and these stones shall [let these stones] be a *zikkārōn* forever").[71] To this end, the tradition fact which the stones recall, namely that the waters were cut off before the ark on its passage over the Jordan, is recited. The question-answer form, therefore retains its conventional function of explaining the permanent "sign-ness" of a specific object. Again one sees the similarity with the function of the *ôth* schema significative etiology.

---

[69] _Josua_, pp. 31 ff.

Although the word *ôth* appears in this passage, and indeed parallel to *zikkārōn* in a portion of the question-answer schema, the conventional *ôth* structure is not obvious. Yet the main outlines are clear enough to allow the supposition that the force of the form is still being exerted in the tradition. The twelve stones are to be an *ôth* whose significance as "sign" is given by the question-answer schema. It is important to note that the latter not only remains unaltered by its proximity with *ôth* motifs, but smoothly assumes an important role in providing the meaning of a "sign." The whole piece in addition to providing for instruction of the young, certainly functions similarly to an *ôth* significative etiology.

---

[70] The appearance of אשר at the beginning of the answer (vs. 7) does not significantly alter the form. It is still a matter of stipulating an answer which is to be recited in response to a question.

[71] The precise translation of והיו .... לזכרון , of course, is uncertain. I favor reading a conversive *waw* since עד-עולם elsewhere never appears in historical narration, and is always oriented toward the future in petition, promise, command, threat, homily, etc. Occasionally such speeches can be referred to as past events (e.g. I Sam. 2:30; I Chron. 15:2; 17:12.14.22; 23:13; Jer. 35:6), but in themselves the speech is always open to the future. A clear indication of this orientation is given in the common phrase מעתה ועד-עולם , e.g. Isa. 9:6; 59:21; Ps. 113:2.

Thus, the various degrees of combined forms--*ôth* schema and a fragment of an answer (Ex. 13:5-10), question-answer schema and a loose *ôth* structure (Jos. 4:6 f.), *ôth* and question-answer schema combined intact (Ex. 13:11-16)--show the ease with which two formally distinct structures can merge. The lack of significant alteration upon merger confirms the conclusion that the schemata possess a mutual function, namely to provide a significative etiology. One should note the fact that the pure question-answer schemata as well as the mixed forms, appear only in Deuteronomy or Deuteronomy type material.[72]

---

[72] No real parallels in the ancient near eastern literature are known to me. A sampling of ritual texts yielded nothing. Cf. Pritchard, *ANET*^{2}, pp. 325-358; also E. Reiner, *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations* (Graz, 1958). Nor do the northwest Semitic inscriptions, including the Ugaritic texts, show a prescriptive question-answer schema. The device of citing a question and its answer is, of course, characteristic of wisdom materials in the Old Testament (cf., for example, Prov. 23:29 f.; 29:20; Job 28:12 ff.). In this context belongs such rhetorical usages exemplified in the "Dialogue of Pessimism" (W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1960], text 6, lines 79 ff.):

> "What, then, is good?"
> "To have my neck and your neck broken,
> And to be thrown into the river is good."

Probably the Egyptian speech of Atum, along with explanatory glosses, dating from the second millenium version of the *Book of the Dead*, belongs in this "wisdom" use of rhetorical

PART C. SIGNIFICATIVE ETIOLOGICAL NARRATIVE

The one remaining task is to see how the ôth and question-answer schemata are related, on the primary level of tradition, to a wider narrative context. The form critical study has already pointed to a conclusion, for neither form shows a necessary functional link with narrative material. Both types occur only in a speech, and in no way require a "story" for their integrity and significance.

This conclusion is immediately obvious with respect to the question-answer schema in Dt. 6:20-25. Not only does the form function independently of its immediate context as a prescriptive speech, but the relational lines to a wider context cannot possibly be drawn to narrative. This is so in a general sense because the prologue of Deuteronomy is cast entirely as a Moses speech, and specifically because chapter 6 contains no genuine narration. By definition, then, the question-answer schemata are independent of a "story" context. The mixed form in Ex. 13:11-16, since it stands as an independent pericope, in no way contradicts this conclusion.[73]

---

question and answer (cf. Pritchard, ANET², pp. 1 f.). A similar rhetorical device appears often in Akkadian letters from various periods, but clearly shows no relation to the Old Testament significative etiology. Cf. for example, R. Pfeiffer, State Letters of Assyria (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1935), numbers 234 and 266.

[73] If a genuine mixed form is present in Ex. 13:3-10, the conclusion borne out here also, since this section is likewise independent of the context.

The fact is borne out equally well in Ex. 24:24-27a. This passage conforms to the schematic pattern, and predictably shows signs of being secondarily placed in the wider context. Verses 21-23.27b belong to J[74] yet share no stylistic features with vss. 24-27a. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the latter originally had nothing to do with the J account of Passover.

Similarly, Jos. 4:21 f. form a self-contained unit which gives some indication of having been secondarily brought to its present location. It is set off from vss. 23 f. by the roughness of transition from vs. 22 to vs. 23; the shift to second person address in the latter sharply contrasts with the recitative style of vs. 22. Whether or not vss. 21 f. are secondarily joined to the preceding tradition is debatable; critics are divided because the evidence is not decisive. However, the preceding narrative in all its complex stages of growth reports the origin of twelve stones, and vss. 21 f. go their own thematic way in dwelling on the stones' significance. Moreover, the question-answer schema was clearly inserted into Ex. 12, stood alone in Dt. 6 (also Ex. 13:11-16), and in a mixed formulation was shown to be secondary expansion in

---

[74] The commentators are virtually in unanimous agreement on this point. Cf. for example, Baentsch, Exodus-Lev-Num, pp. 100 f. (who gives many stylistic keys to the identification); Beer, Exodus, pp. 62 ff.; Noth, Exodus, pp. 97 f.; cf. also Lohfink, Hauptgebot, pp. 121 ff.

Jos. 4:1-8.[75] It seems likely, therefore, that the linkage to the material in the latter parts of Jos. 4 is likewise secondary.

Similarly, the study of the ôth schema revealed no narrative elements constitutive of the form. Where they were present, they represented only a minimal framework which in no way shaped the ôth structure (Gen. 9:8-17; 17:9-14 and the somewhat deteriorated form in Ex. 31:12-17). Where narrative elements assumed more importance (Num. 17:1-5), the pure ôth schema was broken insofar as a short narration reports the creation of a sign and its meaning.

In any case, the ôth form never appears integrally related to developed narrative materials. The schema occurs in a Yahweh speech in Gen. 9 distinctly unrelated to the earlier versions of the flood account, and only loosely tied as epilogue to the priestly story. In Gen. 17, whereas vss. 1-8 and 9-14, which contain the ôth schema, likely belong in one literary stratum,[76] the immediate context for the ôth form is speech rather than narrative. In fact, the entire chapter is characterized by its lack of developed narrative features. The same is true of Ex. 31:12-17, which provides the ôth schemata with only a minimal narrative framework characteristic of this entire section of P legislation (Ex. 25-31). Finally, Num. 17:1-5 are very loosely related to the traditions given in Num. 16. There are no real ties to the older layers still visible (i.e., 16:12-15, parts of vss. 25-34), and only loose connections to the P stratum now dominant in the final text form.[77] Indeed the latter reaches its dramatic climax in 16:35 where Yahweh's wrathful fire settles the dispute forming the core of the tradition. At best, the ôth schema in Num. 17 sounds a subordinate motif in the whole complex.

---

[75] Cf. above, p. 153f.

[76] So von Rad, Priesterschrift, pp. 20 ff.

It is clear, then, that neither the ôth schema, nor the question-answer form is integrally related to narrative. They, rather, stand alone as speech, epilogue, or secondary expansion on older material. Each form, as shown above, functions to transmit a significative etiology. But neither can be used as a mark of etiological narrative.

---

[77] Most commentators assign Num. 17:1-5 to a P redactor. Cf. for example, Baentsch, Exodus-Lev-Num, p. 549; Holzinger, Numeri, p. 69; Gray, Numbers, p. 208.

SECTION III

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

As described in the introduction, the task of this investigation was to define in controlled circumstances certain repetitive features, motifs, or formulae as marks of narrative material whose main function was etiological.

With regard to the etymological materials, two distinct forms expressive of etiological interests were found to be operative. Form I was structured so as to report a naming (always with ויקרא or ותקרא), a name, and its reason (making a word play on the name). This form showed no functional connections with narrative material surrounding it, and hence could not serve as a mark of etymological etiological narrative.

A second form was characterized by a reported event from which an inference to a name was drawn (by means of an על-כן conclusive clause, and often completing a word play). This Form II could be a feature of etymological etiological narrative. Indeed, the essential structure remained unaltered in brief reports of varying complexity, and in two relatively developed narratives (Gen. 11:1-9; Gen. 26:23-33). In both latter cases, the inference was drawn from an indispensable element in the dramatic movement; that is, the name was based on the resolution of a tension present at the beginning of the narrative.

It is important to note that in no case was the etymological interest a focal point for extensive narrative tradition. The two most complex occurrences of Form II were in stories only anecdotal in length; of the many passages sharing characteristics of both Form I and II, the two most highly developed clearly showed the etymologies to be subordinate to other narrative interests. Most of the time, etymological etiology was expressed by a formula (Form I) or short report (Form II and Mixed Forms) in secondary or at least subordinate layers of tradition. Therefore, as marks of etiological narrative, the etymological forms offer little. It seems likely that in Israel, the etymological interest was not a real force in the building of extensive narrative material.

The _ôth_ schema and the question-answer form were also discussed as etiological motifs. Both of these forms explained the origin and "sign-ness," i.e., significance in Israel's common life, of certain phenomena or customs. Yet both forms stood alone as speech, epilogue, or secondary expansion on older material. Neither form showed a constitutive link to narrative traditions, and thus could not serve as a mark of etiological narrative. The interest in preserving and transmitting certain known phenomena as memory signs apparently lacked the power to give rise to extensive narrative material.

The results of this investigation parallel those of

B. S. Childs, who found that

> in the great majority of cases, the formula 'until this day' has been secondarily added as a redactional commentary on existing traditions.[1]

Thus, even this widely accepted feature of etiological narrative turns out to be much less reliable as an identifier than previously assumed. Together, our results begin to show how elusive this category of marks really can be. One suspects that the locus of criteria commonly used to identify etiological narrative all along has been within the interpreter rather than the material itself.

The suspicion is not less grounded when one now looks at the manner in which sundry types of alleged etiological narrative have been reconstructed and posited as earlier stages of tradition now preserved in the Old Testament. Gunkel, for example, brilliantly and systematically employed what might be called an inferential model in reconstructing the "original sense" of many of the sagas in Genesis. Typical of his method is the treatment of Gen. 19:1-28.[2] According to Gunkel, the historical impetus for the early form of the saga must have been the sight of utter desolation in the Dead Sea area. Whoever gazed on the scene would say, "Why has Yahweh done this to this land? What caused this fierce anger?" And then one would answer, "Therefore--because they have sinned against Yahweh--his anger burned against this land." The saga, then, was originally concerned with the origin of an unusual and surprising situation.[3]

---

[1] JBL 82 (1963), pp. 289 f.

[2] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 215.

Obviously Gunkel has provided a methodological program for working within the classical definition of etiological narrative. One draws from a story an inference which reflects in some way a given historical circumstance, ("Therefore, his anger burned against this land."), supposes this to be an answer to a previous question which originally gave rise to the entire tradition, and thereby understands the story itself as justification for the inference already supplied. Gunkel followed this program throughout his commentary on Genesis, and fathered the widespread reconstructions later made on quite diverse materials.[4] Recently, for example, Martin Noth has understood Joshua 2 and 6:17b.22.23.25 as a story which seeks to explain the presence of a "House of Rahab" (regarded as Canaanite) in the midst of Israel.[5] It is clear that he has implicitly imposed an inferential model on an extensive narrative which in fact contains no inferential statement. Indeed, Childs has argued that the phrase in Jos. 6:25, "and she dwelt in Israel to this day," not only cannot be taken in an inferential sense, but relative to vs. 17, must be secondary to the main tradition.[6]

---

[3] The general lines of Gunkel's reconstruction have been widely accepted (though not unanimously), if one disregards the voluminous debate on the historicity of the catastrophe and its geographical location. Cf. for example, Driver, Genesis, p. 203 and Skinner, Genesis, pp. 310 ff.; von Rad, Genesis, p. 216, strongly suggests Gunkel's view; perhaps Speiser (Genesis, p. 142) agrees in part.

[4] Cf., for example, the program for exegesis of blessings such as are found in Gen. 9:25 ff. or 48:19 ff.: "The goal of our exegesis of the blessing (i.e., 9:25 ff.) must be to recognize the historical situation which the narrator has in view, and to understand the blessing itself as a naive explanation of the relationships of that time." Genesis, p. 80. Cf. also p. 242 (Gen. 22).

The more pervasive difficulty here, to which my work speaks, is that this inferential model is never actually attested with extensive narrative tradition. The obvious examples of the pattern in etymological materials have been shown to occur in short reports secondary or subordinate to the main dramatic movement of the wider context. At most, and only two times at that, it appears in developed narratives anecdotal in length. There is no existent inferential model among etymological etiologies comparable, say, to the Rahab story, or the Sodom saga, in length and degree of literary development.

Furthermore, a study of those inferential clauses beginning with על-כן or לכן which deal with something other than etymology, and which show any possible link to etiological interests, leads to a similar conclusion.

---

[5] M. Noth, Josua, pp. 22 f.

[6] B. S. Childs, JBL 82 (1963), p. 286.

1. על-כן (לכן) with a qatal verb form

(a) I Sam. 10:10-12 reports that Saul met a band of prophets at Gibeah and began to prophesy along with them. The spectators asked, among other things, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" From this report, the immediate inference is drawn:

על-כן היתה למשל
הגם שאול בנביאים

The impersonal formulation of the inference, the repetition of phraseology in the spectators' question and the proverbial saying, as well as the frequent use of the verb nb' and its related noun, show clearly that the whole piece functions analogously to a simple Form II etymological report. The narrative material surely intends to ground a popular expression in a particular incident in Saul's rise to power. The two verses, however, express at best a subordinate theme in the larger context.[7] Indeed, vss. 10-12(13a) seem somewhat ill fitted to follow vs. 9, which gives the impression of summarily ending an episode.[8] In any case, the fact that this etiology appears in chapter 19 in quite another context indicates that it is only loosely rooted in specific narrative traditions about Saul, and thus is not likely to be linked integrally to this account of Saul's annointing and the miraculous "signs."

---

[7] Cf. Gressmann, Geschichtsschreibung, pp. 26 ff.; Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, p. 86. Cf. also Smith, Samuel, p. 70.

[8] Cf. A. Weiser, Samuel: seine geschichtliche Aufgabe und Religiöse Bedeutung (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962), p. 59.

(b) The closest formal parallel to this passage appears in Jos. 14:14. Caleb pleas for possession of the hill country (14:6-12) and is given Hebron as an inheritance (vs. 13). A concluding remark immediately follows:

על-כן היתה-חברון לכלב ....עד היום הזה

יען אשר מלא אחרי יהוה ....

Although similar in form to I Sam. 10:12, this verse functions quite differently. To be sure, the phrase "until this day"--whether modifying לנחלה or היתה....לכלב --establishes a continuity into the present of the narrator. In this respect, the clause seems to be an inference whose truth is applicable in all time. Yet the על-כן clause does not carry the same force here as it does in I Sam. 10:12. The latter derives a popular saying from a reported speech. Logically, this means that a causal relationship between two states of affairs is inferred, and given expression by על-כן . The effect is to bring a new element (the proverb) into relation with an old (the speech) so that the old provides a reason for the new.

Now nothing of the sort is going on in Jos. 14:14. There is no inference of causality simply because no new element is introduced. Verse 14, rather, summarizes in almost identical words what has already been asserted in vs. 13b.

Moreover, as Childs has noted, the verse in question reflects a theological doctrine of the deuteronomist (cf. vs. 9) who presupposes a previously existing tradition (Num. 13-14; Dt. 1:19 ff.), and thus cannot be forced into an etiological mold.[9] Finally, one should note that the specific locale, Hebron, is not mentioned until the very end of the episode extending over vss. 6-14. This further confirms Childs' point that the interest lay elsewhere than in providing an explanation of Caleb's claim to Hebron.[10] Thus Jos. 14:14 does not function as an etiology.

(c) In the account of David's dealings with Achish (I Sam. 27:1-7), a short tradition reports that Ziklag was given to David as a dwelling place (vss. 5-6a). The inference is then drawn:

לכן היתה צקלג למלכי יהודה עד־היום הזה

Viewing the form of the whole, and the inferential function of the לכן clause, one is justified in seeing here an etiological form parallel to that in I Sam. 10:10-12 and those of Form II etymological etiological reports. However, the phrase "Kings of Judah" only refers to monarchs of the period following the division of the kingdom. If vs. 6b, then, were original to this tradition, the force of the anecdote would have been to explain a late monarchial claim on Ziklag. But in view of I Sam. 30, where David's claim to this city is undisputed, such an original function for the tradition is neither necessary nor likely. Hence, the inference of ownership is probably secondary.[11] In any case, even if one were to judge vss. 5-6 as integral etiological tradition, it comprises no more than a brief report.

---

[9] Childs, JBL 82 (1963), p. 287.

[10] Against Noth, Josua, p. 84.

(d) The remaining passages, although formally similar, and perhaps related distantly to etiological interests, functioned quite differently, and in various ways were disconnected from a narrative context:

(1) Motive clauses in legislation:
Ex. 20:11; Num. 18:24

(2) Prescriptive speech: Lev. 17:12

(3) Secondary material: Dt. 10:9a

---

[11] Childs, _op_. _cit_., p. 287.

(e) By way of summary, the על־כן inferential clause with qatal verb form, exclusive of etymologies, functioned etiologically and integrally with narrative material only one time, i.e., I Sam. 10:10-12. Perhaps there is a second example in I Sam. 27:5-6. In no case was the inferential model associated with extensive narrative materials.

2. על־כן (לכן) with yiqtal verb form

(a) Gen. 10:9 reports that Nimrod was a mighty hunter before Yahweh. An inference is then drawn:

על־כן יאמר כנמרד גבור ציד לפני יהוה

The repetition of phraseology in vss. 9a and 9b leave little doubt that the על־כן clause, formulated with an indefinite subject and to be translated, "it is said," functions integrally with brief narrative material. One sees here a simple report in two parts:

(1) Report

(2) Inference based directly on the report

The structure obviously is analogous to a simple Form II etymological report, and to I Sam. 10:10-12. The unit functions etiologically, that is, to explain the origin of a popular expression.[12] It is also clear that vs. 9 is presently independent of any wider narrative context.[13] The report is simply one of several items in a series which preserves fragments of Nimrod traditions.

---

[12] Cf. the corrupt text in Gen. 22:14b. Cf. above, p. 46 f.

(b) A similar form is likely contained in II Sam. 5:8. The text is very uncertain.[14] An על-כן clause, however, is clear in the latter half of the verse:

על-כן יאמרו עור ופסח לא יבוא אל-הבית

Since the third masculine plural has no obvious referent, the subject of the clause is indefinite, and most naturally translated as a general present: "they say" or "one says" or even "it is said. . . ." The formulation is clearly parallel to the Niphal of Gen. 10:9. Probably an inference is drawn from the narrated quote of vs. 8a, as the repetition of הפסחים ...עורים and עור ופסח indicates. It seems likely that the now obscure verse originally functioned to ground this particular restriction on blind and lame persons. Yet the connections with vss. 6 f. and 9 are very loose, and probably secondary. Verse 8 actually breaks the continuity between vss. 7 and 9, and is chronologically out of place following a report of victory in vs. 7. At most, therefore, vs. 8

---

[13] Gunkel, Genesis, p. 89; Holzinger, Genesis, p. 99; Skinner, Genesis, p. 208.

[14] Cf. Driver, Notes², pp. 260 ff.

comprises a simple etiological report without demonstrable links to a developed narrative tradition.

(c) I Sam. 19:18-24 provides an example of this fundamental report structure along with a more developed "story" context. There is clear dramatic movement in this piece. Saul sends one, two, three groups of messengers to capture David. Each prophesies. Finally Saul himself goes (גם הוא), and even he prophesies (גם הוא vss. 23.24). From this dramatic resting point, the inference to a proverbial saying is directly drawn:

על-כן יאמרו הגם שאול בנביאם

This conclusive clause is typically formulated with an indefinite subject. The consistent use of the verb nb' (vss. 20.21^2.23.24) and emphatic גם המה or גם הוא (vss. 20.21^2.23.24^2), as well as the measured dramatic progression, indicate that these verses comprise an integral unit quite independent of its wider context.[15] The similarities with Form II etymological etiological narrative are obvious. Here the material--consisting of a two part form essentially unaltered from that of Gen. 10:9 and

---

[15] On the literary criticism, cf. Gressmann, Geschichtsschreibung, pp. 87 ff.; Nowack, Richter, Ruth . . . Samuelis, pp. 100 ff.; Smith, Samuel, p. 181; Hertzberg, I and II Samuel, p. 167.

II Sam. 5:8--functions etiologically to ground a popular saying in a particular event. However, even with this degree of literary complexity, the inferential structure includes narrative traditions merely of anecdotal length.

(d) The remaining examples of similar על-כן clauses, even though related to etymological interests, have lost any constitutive connections with narrative material, or have been secondarily added to previously existing traditions.

(1) Sundry concluding remarks, secondary to their contexts:

I Sam. 5:5 and Gen. 32:33[16]

Gen. 2:24[17]

(2) Redactional linkage of independent tradition:

Num. 21:14.27[18]

---

[16] Cf. Childs, *JBL* 82 (1963), pp. 287 f. Gen. 32:33 is interesting because it offers the only example, exclusive of etymological material, of a *kî* explanatory clause giving the grounds for the etymological inference. One may suppose that the form of this verse is influenced by the etymological pattern occasionally observed (e.g., Gen. 11:9).

[17] Opinions differ as to whether or not vs. 24 represents a secondary layer in the tradition. The analysis of the etymological elements (cf. above, p. 93f.) tends to indicate its independence of the structure of vss. 18-23. Moreover, the dramatic movement from tension (no helpmate) to resolution (a helpmate is finally created) does not directly motivate the inference made in vs. 24. The latter in my opinion, goes in quite a surprising direction. In any case, the narrative tradition in question is hardly more than anecdotal in length.

[18] Cf. Gressmann, *Anfänge*, pp. 113 f. and 116 f.; Holzinger, *Numeri*, p. 95 and pp. 99 f. Gray, *Numbers*, pp. 294 and 299.

These passages represent, therefore, a decadent stage in the history of this inferential structure.

(e) To summarize, the על-כן conclusive clause with a yiqtal verb form, exclusive of etymological material, functioned etiologically and integrally with narrative tradition in a way which was analogous to the pattern of Form II etymological reports. The clause was used to ground proverbial sayings (I Sam. 19:24; II Sam. 5:8; Num. 21:27; Gen. 10:9), cultic practices (Gen. 32:33; I Sam. 5:5), and a biological phenomenon (Gen. 2:24). In only one case was there a developed "story" context integrally related to the inference (I Sam. 19:18-24). Even here, the material was anecdotal in length. Thus, there is no attested example of the inferential model being integrally associated with extensive narrative tradition.

In the light of these conclusions, the pervasive difficulty in the usual reconstruction or identification of alleged etiological narrative is brought into sharp focus. The inferential model commonly employed is never attested with extensive narrative tradition, and only rarely with relatively developed story material anecdotal in length. It is with doubtful justification, therefore, that an inferential model, explicitly or implicitly, can be used in discussing extensively developed traditions as alleged etiological narrative. To do so involves an unwarranted assumption of a breadth of applicability simply unattested in the Old Testament texts. If the inferential structure ever shaped an extensive "story" tradition, it is odd indeed that nothing of this has survived. It seems more likely--in view of the copious examples of short reports--that this particular model, or better, creative mold, never achieved the formative power necessary to provide the focus for narrative traditions of greater complexity than anecdotes similar to Gen. 11:1-9 or I Sam. 19:18-24.

If this is correct, then those instances where the inferential model is operative, e.g., etymologies of the Form II type and certain others, most of which involve proverbial sayings, ought to be separated clearly from that large body of narrative material which does not conform to the pattern. The question is still open if the latter be etiological, how the material actually functions, and what its identifying marks might be. It only confuses matters, however, to assume a homogeneity of form and function where none exists.

The evidence marshalled, then, limits somewhat the current discussion of etiological narrative. But it also points toward an area of further investigation. The problem now, if one continues to focus upon marks, is to devise a methodology which will yield results in those cases of alleged etiological tradition where no clear formula or inferential structure is apparent. Briefly, the question is: are there distinctive signs in this material which show it to function etiologically? An answer may require a broader approach. That is, a wider knowledge of the various marks which reveal a story's function is needed to bring a measure of control to the diverse literature. If such devices can be isolated and identified as conventional aspects of an Israelitic narrative art, then important criteria will have been gained for the examination of Hebrew stories, always done, of course, in light of their various stages of growth. Perhaps then one can begin to speak a little more assuredly of an etiological function for a given narrative.[19]

---

[19] Among form critics, this sort of broadly based research which strives for a high degree of precision, has only recently begun to appear. Cf. W. Richter, Untersuchungen, expecially pp. 344 ff. Cf. Also L. Alonso-Schökel, "Erzählkunst im Buche der Richter," Biblica 42 (1961), pp. 143-172.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baentsch, B. *Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1903.

Beer, George. *Exodus*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1939.

Benzinger, I. *Die bücher der Chronik*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901.

deBoer, P.A.H. "Genesis 11:1-9," *Nieuwe Theologische Studien*, 24 (1941).

_______. "Genesis 32:23-33. Some Remarks on Composition and Character of the Story," *Nederlands Theologisch Tidsskrift*, 1946-47, pp. 149-63.

_______. *Research into the Text of 1 Samuel I-XVI*. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1938.

Bright, J. *Early Israel in Recent History Writing: A Study in Method*. Chicago: Allenson, 1956.

Budde, K. *Das Buch der Richter*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1897.

_______. *Die Bücher Samuel*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1902.

Burney, C. F. *The Book of Judges*. London: Livingston's, 1918.

Caspari, W. *Die Samuelbücher*. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche, 1926.

Childs, B. S. "A Study of the Formula 'Until this Day,'" *JBL*, 82 (1963), pp. 279-292.

David, M. *Die Adoption im Altbabylonischen Recht*. Leipzig: Weicher, 1927.

Driver, S. R. *The Book of Exodus*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1918.

_______. *The Book of Genesis*. Seventh edition. London: Methuen, 1909.

_______. *Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel*. Second edition. Oxford; Clarendon Press, 1913.

Ehrlich, A.. *Randglossen zur Hebräischen Bibel*. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1908.

Ehrlich, E. L. *Der Traum im Alten Testament*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1953.

Eising, H. *Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur Jakobserzáhlung*. Emsdetten, 1940.

Eissfeldt, O. "'Gut Glück!' im Semitischen Namengebung," *JBL*, 82 (1963), pp. 195-200.

______. *Stammessage und Novelle in den Geschichten von Jakob und seinen Sohnen*. Göttingen: Eucharisterion, 1923.

Elliger, K. "Der Jakobskampf am Jabbok," *ZThK*, 48 (1951), pp. 1 ff.

______. *Leviticus*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966.

Ewald, H. *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1879.

Fichtner, J. "Die Etymologische Ätiologie in den Namengebung der Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testament," *VT*, 6 (1956), pp. 372 ff.

Fohrer, G. *Überlieferung und Geschichte des Exodus: Eine Analyse von Exodus* 1-15. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.

Gray, G. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1903.

Gray, G. B. *Studies in Hebrew Proper Names*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.

Gressmann, H. *Die Älteste geschichtsschreibung und prophetie Israels*. Second edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921.

______. *Die Anfänge Israels*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1914.

______. *Mose und seine Zeit*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1913.

Gross, H. "Bedeutet die Opferung Isaaks das Ende der Menschenopfer?" *Katechetische Blätter*, 82/3 (1957), pp. 97-99.

Guillaume, A. "Paronomasia in the Old Testament," *JSS*, 9 (1964), pp. 282 ff.

Gunkel, H. *Genesis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1901.

Heitger, A. *Hagar: Eine Kritische und Exegetische Untersuchung zu den Genesis 16 und 21*. Dissertation: Breslau. Bonn: Neuendorf, 1934.

Heller, Jan. "Der Name Eva," *Archiv Orientalni*, 26/4 (1958), pp. 636-56.

Hertzberg, H. W. *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1953.

_______. *I and II Samuel*. ET of the German second edition, 1960. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.

Hölscher, G. *Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Heidelberg: Winter, 1942.

_______. *Geschichtsschreibung in Israel: Untersuchungen zur Jahvisten und Elohisten*. Lund: Gleerup, 1952.

Holzinger, H. *Exodus*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1900.

_______. *Genesis*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1898.

_______. *Das Buch Josua*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901.

_______. *Numeri*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1903.

Hylander, I. *Der Literarische Samuel-Saul-Komplex Traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht*. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksell, 1932.

Jensen, Ad. E. *Mythos und Kult bei Naturvölkern*. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1951. Pp. 87-100.

Jolles, Andre. *Einfache Formen*. Tübingen: Max Niemyer, 1930.

Kaufmann, Y. *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Palestine*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University, 1953.

Keller, C. A. *Das Wort Oth als Offenbarungszeichen Gottes*. Basel: Hönen, 1946.

_______. "Über einige alttestamentliche Heiligtumslegenden," *ZAW*, 67 (1955), pp. 141-168, and 68 (1956), pp. 85-97.

Key, A. "The Giving of Proper Names in the OT," *JBL*, 83 (1964), pp. 55-59.

Kilian, R. *Literarkritische und Formgeschichtliche Untersuchung des Heiligkeitsgesetzes*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1963.

Klostermann, D. *Der Pentateuch: Beitrage zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte.* Leipzig: Deichert'sche, 1906.

Köhler, L., and W. Baumgartner. *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1953.

König, E. *Historisch-Kritisches Lehrgebäude der Hebräischen Sprache.* Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1881-97.

Kropat, A. *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik.* Giessen: Töpelmann, 1909.

Kutsch, E. "Gideons Berufung und Altarbau," *Theologische Literature Zeitung*, 81 (1956), pp. 75-84. fung

Lehming, S. "Zur Erzählung von der Geburt der Jakobssöhne," *VT*, 13 (1963), pp. 74-81.

Maag, V. "Jakob-Esau-Edom," *Theologische Zeitschrift*, 13/6 (1957), pp. 418-29.

Maier, J. *Das altisraelitische Ladeheiligtum.* Berlin: Topelmann, 1965.

McKenzie, J. "Jacob at Peniel: Gen. 32:24-32," *CBQ*, 25 (1963), pp. 71-76.

McKenzie, J. L. "The Sacrifice of Isaac," *Scripture*, 9 (1957), pp. 79-84.

McNeile, A. H. *The Book of Exodus.* London: Methuen, 1908.

Möhlenbrink, K. "Die Landnahmesagen des Buches Josua," *ZAW*, 15 (1938), pp. 238-268.

Moore, G. *Judges.* New York: Scribner's Sons, 1895 [1947].

Nilsson, M. P. *Geschichte der Griechischen Religion.* Vol. I. Munich: Beck, 1941-50. Pp. 25-34.

Noth, M. "Der Beitrag der Archeologie zur Geschichte Israels," *VT Suppl.*, 7 (1959).

______. *Exodus: A Commentary.* A Translation of the German 1959 edition. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

______. *Die Israelitischen Personennamen im Rahman der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung.* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928.

______. *Das Buch Josua*. Second edition. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1953.

______. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965. A translation of German *Das Dritte Buch Mose, Leviticus* (ATD); Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1962.

______. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948.

______. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1943.

Nowack, D. W. *Richter, Ruth und Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1902.

Opelt, I. "Etymologie," in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum VI*, PP. 797-844.

Pedersen, J. *Israel: Its Life and Culture*. London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

Power, E. "Josua 5:9 and the Institution of Circumcision," *The Irish Theological Quarterly*, 18 (1951), pp. 368-72.

Procksch, D. Otto. *Die Genesis*. Third edition. Leipzig: Deichert, 1924.

von Rad, G. *Deuteronomy*. ET of 1964 German edition. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.

______. *Genesis*. ET of German second edition, 1953. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.

______. *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.

Ratschow, C. H. *Werden und Wirken: Eine Untersuchung des Wortes "hajah" als Beitrag zur Wirklichkeitserfassung des Alten Testamentes*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1941.

Reventlow, H. *Das Heiligkeitsgesetzes*. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1961.

Richter, W. *Die Bearbeitungen des "Retterbuches" in der Deuteronomischen Epoche*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1964.

______. *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zum Richterbuch*. Bonn: Hanstein, 1963.

Röhrich, L. *Märchen und Wirklichkeit*. Second edition. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1964.

Rothstein, J. W., and J. Hänel. *Das erste buch der Chronik*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1927.

Saydon, P. P. "The Crossing of the Jordan," *CBQ* (1950), pp. 194-207.

Scharbert, J. "Israelitische Geschichtsschreibung im Buche Genesis," *Bibel und Kirche*, 17/3 (1962), pp. 66-69.

Seeligmann, J. "Aetiological Elements in Biblical Historiography" (in mod. Heb., Eng. summary), *Zion: Quarterly for Research in Jewish History*, 26 (1961), pp. 141-169.

Simpson, C. A. *Composition of the Book of Judges*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.

_______. *The Early Traditions of Israel*. Oxford; Blackwell, 1948.

Smith, H. P. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Soggin, J. A. "Die Geburt Benjamins, Gen. 35:16-20(21)," *VT*, 11 (1961), pp. 432-440.

_______. "Gilgal, Passah, und Landnahme," *Suppl. VT*, 15 (1965), pp. 263 ff.

_______. "Kultätiologische Sagen und Katechese im Hexateuch," *VT*, 10 (1960), pp. 341-347.

Speiser, E. A. *Genesis*. New York: Doubleday, 1964.

_______. "Mesopotamian Motifs in the Early Chapters of Genesis," *Expedition*, 5/1 (1962), pp. 18-19.43.

_______. "Word Plays on the Creation Epic's Version of the Founding of Babylon," *Orientalia*, 25 (1956), pp. 317-23.

Stamm, J. *Die Akkadische Namengebung*. Leipzig: Dichert, 1939.

Steuernagel, C. *Deuteronomium und Josua*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1900.

Vogt, E. "Die Erzählung vom Jordanübergang," *Biblica*, 46 (1965), pp. 125-148.

Volz, P., and W. Rudolph, *Der Elohist als Erzähler: Ein irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* Giessen: Töpelmann, 1933.

Wadler, A. *Der Turm von Babel: Urgemeinschaft der Sprachen.* Basel: Geering, 1935.

Wellhausen, J. *Die Komposition des Hexateuchs und der Historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1899.

_______. *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1872.

Westermann, C. "Arten der Erzählung in der Genesis" in *Forschung am Alten Testament (Gesammelte Studien).* Munich: Kaiser, 1964. Pp. 9-91.

Zimmermann, F. "The Births of Perez and Zerah," *JBL*, 64 (1945), pp. 377-78.

_______. "Folk Etymology of Biblical Names," *Suppl. VT*, 15 (1965), pp. 311-326.